DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 817 CE 018 337

TITLE	Report on Joint DHEW/DOL Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act Workshops (Dallas, Texas; San Diego, California; Boston, Massachusetts; Atlanta, Georgia; and Cincinnati, Ohio, December 12, 1977 - January 20, 1978).
INSTITUTION	Dingle Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Youth Programs.
PUB DATE	78
CONTRACT	99-8-1242-36-9
NOTE	82p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Conference Reports; *Cooperative Programs; Credits; *Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; Federal Regulation; *Government School Relationship; *Job Training; Program Development; School Industry Relationship; *Youth Employment; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the major points and questions discussed at five regional workshops held to help the participants develop Local Education Agency (LEA) and Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) prime sponsor agreements as mandated by the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA). The content is presented in five sections. The first, a summary report of the workshops, highlights the major concerns that were raised during the workshops. Section 2 consists of the following two workshop presentations: "YEDPA: Obligations and Opportunities for Education" and "Promoting Cooperation Among the Education and Employment and Training Communities under YEDPA." Section 3 summarizes the four seminar sessions held concurrently at each workshop dealing with the areas of implementing YEDPA, work experience, career development, and academic credit. Section 5 lists the names of the workshop facilitators and presenters, while the last section presents a composite summary of the participants' evaluations from all five workshops. (EM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Report on Joint DHEW/DOL Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act Workshops

U.S. Department of Labor
Ray Marshall, Secretary

Employment and Training Administration
Ernest G. Green
Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training

Office of Youth Programs

This report was prepared by Dingle Associates, Inc., Washington, D. C., under contract No. 99-8-1242-36-9 with the Employment and Training Administration, U. S. Department of Labor. Researchers undertaking government sponsored projects are encouraged to express their own judgment. The interpretations and viewpoints stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the U. S. Department of Labor.

ED164817

CE 018 337

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FOREWORD

This report contains summaries of major points made and questions discussed at five workshops on the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA). Held jointly by the U.S. Department of Labor and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the workshops took place from December 12, 1977 through January 20, 1978 in Dallas, San Diego, Boston, Atlanta, and Cincinnati.

Section I of this document consists of a summary report on these efforts prepared by the U.S. Department of Labor. Section II includes the complete text of keynote speeches delivered at the five workshops. Section III contains a brief report on concurrent sessions presented at each of the five workshops in the areas of Implementing YEDPA, Career Development, Work Experience, and Academic Credit. Section IV consists of a list of facilitators and presenters at the various workshops, while Section V is a composite summary of evaluation forms completed by participants following each workshop.

It is hoped that this report will be useful to participants who attended the various workshops as well as to others interested in the implementation of Local Education Agency (LEA)/Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) agreements.

CONTENTS

I. SUMMARY OF DHEW/DOL WORKSHOPS ON YOUTH 1

A. Introduction 3
B. Background 4
C. Seminar Summaries 4
D. Conclusion 17

II. KEYNOTE SPEECHES 19

YEDPA: Obligations and Opportunities for American Education 21

Promoting Cooperation Among the Education and Employment and Training Communities Under YEDPA 31

III. SUMMARIES OF INDIVIDUAL SEMINARS HELD AT FIVE YEDPA WORKSHOPS 37

A. Dallas Workshop 41
B. San Diego Workshop 53
C. Boston Workshop 59
D. Atlanta Workshop 65
E. Cincinnati Workshop 71

IV. LIST OF FACILITATORS AND PRESENTERS 75

V. COMPOSITE SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION FORMS, ALL FIVE CONFERENCES 79

I. SUMMARY OF DHEW/DOL WORKSHOPS ON YOUTH

I. SUMMARY OF DHEW/DOL WORKSHOPS ON YOUTH*

A. Introduction

One of the major goals of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) of 1977 is to improve the linkage between employment, training, and education services available to youth. Local education agencies (LEAs) and postsecondary institutions have been involved in employment and training programs to some extent since the 1960's through the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) in-school and summer work experience programs of the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA), as well as programs authorized under the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA). YEDPA, however, goes beyond questions or issues addressed in earlier legislation to those which have not been broached to any significant degree previously, e.g., the development of a partnership through special agreements between LEAs and CETA prime sponsors, and the awarding of academic credit for competencies derived from work experiences gained under the new youth programs.

To facilitate accomplishment of this major goal, a series of five Regional CETA/LEA workshops were convened during December 1977 and January 1978 for the purpose of providing guidance and information to CETA prime sponsors and LEAs on their new roles mandated by the YEDPA and in assisting them in the development of these new institutional linkages. The workshops were designed to aid the formulation of CETA/LEA agreements as required in section 343(d)(1) and (2) of the Act, which governs in-school programs under the Youth Employment and Training Program (YETP). The law states that a minimum of 22 percent of the prime sponsors' YETP allocation must be expended for programs operated through CETA/LEA agreements.

Specifically, the goals of the workshops were to: encourage prime sponsors, LEAs, and other community agencies to collaborate in helping young people; maximize the number of LEAs making agreements with prime sponsors; provide an environment conducive to frank exchange of data and information between prime

*This summary was prepared by the Department of Labor's Office of Community Youth Employment Programs as a summary of the proceedings of the five workshops described in more detail in Section III.

sponsors and LEAs; and finally stimulate the development, adaptation, and spread of better quality career employment experiences for young people, including the design of projects which arrange for provision of academic and/or other credentials which would be helpful for career access and advancement.

B. Background

Planning and designing the workshops were carried out jointly between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (DHEW) and Department of Labor (DOL). Each workshop spanned 1-1/2 days. The major activities included four seminars in the following areas: Academic Credit, Career Development, Work Experience, and Implementing YEDPA. The workshops were held across the nation in Dallas, Texas; San Diego, California; Boston, Massachusetts; Atlanta, Georgia; and Cincinnati, Ohio. The attendance in each ranged from 180 to 242, resulting in approximately 1,000 prime sponsor and LEA staff benefitting from the workshops. Except for the seminar on Implementing YEDPA, each had two facilitators---one representing DHEW and one DOL. A series of questions were designed for the participants to discuss in these seminars using the Phillips 66 approach. This strategy---a small group participatory model---served as an information sharing mechanism for the participants.

C. Seminar Summaries

Following are highlights and concerns that were raised in each of the four seminars.

1. Academic Credit. This seminar focused on questions and program designs prime sponsors and LEAs should address in granting credit for competencies derived in programs under YEDPA. Overall, it was the consensus that (academic) credit should be awarded to youth in the program. However, it was pointed out that the awarding of academic credit is a highly structured activity which is often determined by State and local laws. There are approximately 16,000 LEAs and each one has a different approach to the awarding of credit.

   Academic credit for nontraditional educational activities is an area that has been and is still receiving much consideration by educators and noneducators alike. It was pointed out strongly that this fact must be taken into consideration.

Academic credit was generally defined as "credit that would be applicable to high school graduation." It was defined in the broad sense of the term. The issue then is under what circumstances or how can the awarding of academic credit be accomplished? What should be the role of the LEA and the prime sponsor in this area? It was felt by most that the two parties would have to jointly decide on this and that they must consider some important issues. It is important to note that any arrangements for credit toward graduation for experiences under CETA should be integrated into the structures already established to handle such programs. Existing mechanisms can be adopted. YEDPA should not set up separate systems apart from the educational system.

The groups felt that there was no problem in granting credit as such, but agreed that the LEAs must be responsible for attendance and students' progress. Wherever and whenever credit is to be given, competencies must be preidentified and it was generally agreed that prime sponsors are not in the position of certifying competency.

The competencies required and the kinds of credit generated should be part of the contract between the LEA and the prime sponsor. The amount of credit given for competencies rests with the LEA.

Local school districts set the number of credits required for graduation. Even though academic credit could be given, in most instances no procedures for providing academic credit for work under YEDPA have been negotiated with local school boards. Cooperative education, work experience education, and vocational education, in certain areas of the nation, have procedures for granting academic credit after training, if the training is based on an agreement where responsibilities are described for the local education agencies, for the young person involved, and for the prime sponsor. The emphasis should be on developing quality programs in which certain competencies are developed. If a program can meet such standards, the awarding of credit should be no problem. If the training in Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects (YCCIP) is make-work-type jobs, it would not be suitable for academic credit and no one should expect a youngster to receive academic credit for clean-up programs.

It was generally felt that there is a problem relating established State and local requirements for academic credit to competencies that a youngster will find in the world of work. Competencies in several States are a matter of law and there is very little flexibility in defining these competencies. Each group reiterated that it was the responsibility of the LEA to decide the credit and its appropriateness as it applies to high school graduation, diplomas, or certificates of completion.

In terms of academic credit for work experience, it was noted that some States frown upon simultaneously paying dollars and awarding credit; that is, the schools are opposed to giving both money and credit for work experience. In Utah, the only credit that can be given for work experience is that which is supervised by certificated personnel.

In Alaska, and many other States, the school districts encourage academic credit for work experience. These schools do not make any distinction between in-school or out-of-school work programs in terms of giving credit. Alaska is now taking a look at adapting what is called the "Coos Bay Model." Developed in Oregon, the "Coos Bay Model" is one in which teachers are given the task of going out and looking at particular work sites; identifying the tasks that are performed on the job; and applying those tasks to instructional areas such as mathematics, social studies, science, and others. From that type of assessment the teachers decide to which academic course those kinds of tasks apply, and how much of the course offering those tasks fulfill for credit. In fact, it was mentioned that the majority of high schools throughout the nation now have some type of off-campus work program which generates academic credit for graduation. For those out-of-school persons, some system needs to be developed to link prime sponsors, community-based organizations, and LEAs so that these youth can earn credit also.

Finally, it is important that youngsters master the established competencies. There must be joint decisions on who would measure the competency gained. LEA staff probably should be in control of the actual granting of credit. It was brought up that credit is important in giving experiential programs credibility vis-a-vis students and within

the educational system. The awarding of credit can improve motivation of participants. Also, the development of these programs provides a good basis for cooperation between CETA prime sponsors and LEAs.

2. Career Development. This seminar explored questions dealing with ways of improving the motivation, career exploration, counseling, occupational information, and placement of in-school youth under YEDPA. There seemed to be four major areas which elicited the majority of discussion: services to 14- and 15-year-olds; involvement of the private sector; the availability, quality, and dissemination of career and occupational information; and overcoming sex stereotyping.

   It was generally agreed that 14- and 15-year-olds should receive services provided under YETP. This age group is generally ready to explore careers, participate in field trips, and engage in other activities to increase their career awareness and development.

   Indeed, these types of activities may be particularly useful since this is a key age group in terms of their transition into high school and the world of work. It is at this time that many potential dropouts might be prevented from doing so at age 16 if they were interested and motivated to stay in school. Failure to support programs for 14- and 15-year-olds simply means paying a dearer price later.

   In each of the five workshops, concern was expressed regarding the limitation on the use of the private sector for work experiences because this sector can and should make key contributions to these programs. The private sector can be used in on-the-job training programs and for "job shadowing" where students would merely observe the worker on the job. In addition, business and industry leaders can serve in advisory capacities to the youth prime sponsor planning councils and provide workers to participate in career days in schools to tell students about the world of work. Still, prime sponsors and LEAs desired greater private sector involvement in youth programs.

Career and occupational information can be provided in many ways---some involving a very sophisticated design---where the information is computerized for example. In other cases, career resource centers can be organized in school libraries or guidance offices which pull together occupational information and related services. These centers can be quite effective, especially if they are coupled with a strong guidance counseling activity. Career resource centers are in operation, in many States and in many schools.

Several participants were disappointed that more States were not setting up programs to gather accurate occupational information for schools and prime sponsors within their States. There are eight statewide information systems currently funded by the Career Information Service. There is authority under YEDPA and some of the vocational education amendments for the development of national and State level occupational information coordinating councils.

Finally, in the career development seminars, there was substantial discussion regarding overcoming sexual bias and sex role stereotyping. Several groups noted that services to 14- and 15-year-olds may be helpful in this regard---that basically this problem is a large one involving societal values and norms that neither the educators nor CETA can combat alone. Emphasis needs to be placed on programs of career awareness involving career exploration and career experiences at an early age. The consensus was that career exploration and transition services designed for 16- and 17-year-olds may be offered too late to overcome and reduce these biases that are part of our working society.

3. Work Experience. The work experience seminars focused on questions to be addressed in developing program models which integrate quality work experience with the education curriculum. Most viewed work experience and on-the-job training activities as an opportunity to expand current cooperative and distributive education programs.

With respect to this topic, LEAs and prime sponsors encountered some problems regarding interpretation. There seems to be confusion as to what work experience is as meant by educators and as defined by the Department of Labor. Further, there is misunderstanding about the terms stipend, allowance, and subsidy. It seems that educators are familiar with both paid and nonpaid work experiences, while CETA only deals in work experience involving financial remuneration. The workshops helped to clarify some of these terms.

Paying wages for work experience may cause some problems for LEAs since they do not pay wages to all students, but would have to for CETA enrollees. For example, in established cooperative education programs, the employer must pay the youngster wages. There was some concern that this relationship could be upset if employers decided to use CETA eligibles in their programs only and not pay the wages, since the CETA program could provide these funds.

Two observations were made relative to YCCIP. It is viewed as an employment rather than a vocational training program. If it is to be used as vocational training, the job specifications should be developed jointly by the LEA and prime sponsor and can become the vehicle for determining success or failure of the program. YCCIP remains primarily an out-of-school youth program. Where there are in-school youth, or where youth are attracted back to school, schedules are usually arranged for afternoon or evening work.

Questions were raised relative to the proposed rotation of pupils through various work experience and/or job sites.

Many work experience components are not fully worked out and it was suggested that the following points be considered in developing them: identify interest and aptitudes of youngsters and marry those with placement possibilities; have LEAs participate in training worksite supervisors; assure that work experience sites are productive and that real jobs exist---not just make-work situations.

There was general agreement that school-based counselors should be used to provide testing and to assist students in developing a vocational profile or individual employability plan. Only through testing and individualization can work experience or on-the-job training be made more meaningful.

Prime sponsors and LEA staff seem to have a mutual problem in appreciating the capabilities of one another. It was agreed that within the system there are solutions to these problems. A new system for work experience does not need to be invented; we can use what exists and modify it to fit the conditions under YEDPA and establish a cooperative atmosphere for LEAs and prime sponsors and the youth in the programs.

Lastly, the participants stated that within each State there are many exemplary models of work experience, and these need to be identified and shared among LEAs and prime sponsors.

4. Implementing YEDPA. These seminars focused on a general overview of the legislation and the regulations which govern the new youth programs with particular emphasis on the model program relationships to be developed through CETA/LEA agreements. The seminar was conducted by a panel of three individuals each representing a specific perspective---that of DOL, a prime sponsor, and a local education agency.

   - The DOL Perspective. The legislative history of YEDPA was discussed emphasizing the flexibility accorded to prime sponsors and local education agencies under YEDPA in developing mandated agreements.

     It was stressed that all indications show that YEDPA programs will be funded through FY 1979 and that prime sponsor/LEA agreements will exist beyond the current year. This provides both prime sponsors and educators with the opportunity to improve coordination and strengthen existing linkages. The initial development of an agreement is not an end, but a beginning.

- A Local Education Agency's Perspective. A representative of a local education agency shared views of YEDPA. The organization, a private nonprofit corporation formed by a collaborative of 11 school districts, serves as a facilitator and knowledge broker for programs of common interest to the member districts. The presentation described some observations as to tensions perceived relative to past prime sponsor/LEA collaboration. Briefly, from the educator's perspective these were:

  - poor past history of collaboration;
  - restrictive CETA eligibility income guidelines;
  - lengthy and cumbersome forms;
  - funding uncertainty;
  - lack of emphasis on training in CETA programs;
  - focus of CETA on economically disadvantaged youth;
  - lack of sufficient CETA administrative funds;
  - poor match of funding cycles between the prime sponsor fiscal year and the school year;
  - reduction-in-force problems in public schools due to declining enrollment; and
  - the perception or view that YEDPA contains inherent criticism of public schools.

  Some positive aspects of LEA/prime sponsor collaboration as generated by YEDPA include:

  - considerable new funds for education;
  - mandated partnership of CETA prime sponsors and school systems;

- flexibility permitted in developing agreements;

- mandate that schools focus on hard-to-serve youth;

- opening school-to-work transition responsibility to many parts of society; and

- the reduction-in-force problem, which can provide new roles for teachers in nontraditional instruction.

The presenter concluded with some remarks as to needs and concerns for the future.

- the need for YEDPA programs to be continued for sufficient time to fully determine their effectiveness;

- the need to institutionalize positive changes within school systems;

- the need to build local support;

- the need to do nontraditional evaluation beyond "the numbers game";

- more lead time for planning;

- more private sector involvement; and

- the need to experiment with a mix of low-income and higher-income youth.

- The Prime Sponsor's Perspective. Two representatives of prime sponsors presented their ideas on CETA/LEA relationships.

  One presenter discussed the Dallas experience in developing an LEA/prime sponsor agreement. The beginning of the agreement occurred prior to the passage of YEDPA, and was the result of a school desegregation order. Although the agreement was signed by the prime sponsor and the school systems, two other actors were involved---community-based organizations and the private sector.

The CETA prime sponsor and community-based organizations had worked very closely together. Likewise, the school system and private industry had also had close working relationships. However, these four groups came together for the first time as a result of the negotiations resulting from the desegregation order. CETA and the private sector worked together for the first time. The fruits of this relationship were shown in the Dallas Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects (YIEPP) proposal which included a great deal of private sector participation despite severe time constraints. The thrust of the Dallas story, then, is that a potentially explosive situation was used to establish ongoing relationships among the major segments of the Dallas community which serve youth and which will be continued under YEDPA.

- Baltimore's Harbor City Learning program was presented as an example of a prime sponsor/LEA collaborative process. Harbor City Learning was created to address Baltimore's dropout and truancy problems which had reached epidemic proportions. From a needs assessment survey, Baltimore planners learned that most students dropped out for three basic reasons: (1) nonrelevance of the traditional school curriculum; (2) lack of recognition of individual needs (class sizes averaging 30 to 50); and (3) economic pressures. The Harbor City Learning program was created to address these needs.

  Harbor City Learning is a Baltimore public high school operated by the school system under contract to the Baltimore CETA prime sponsor. The partnership between the prime sponsor and school system has been aided by the local governmental structure. Both the school superintendent, who is chosen by an appointed school board, and the manpower director are members of the Mayor's Cabinet, thus reducing jurisdictional friction. Even so, institu-

tional support for Harbor City Learning has developed slowly. At first, the school system contributed only a principal---now the school system contributes 1 principal, 2 vice principals, 44 teachers and several clerical staff---an in-kind contribution of $650,000 annually. The school system rather than the prime sponsor operates Harbor City, even though the funding is primarily CETA. (Baltimore did not want two competing school systems.) The Harbor City program operates year-round on a tri-semester basis. The "out-of-school" program consists of five vocational clusters of 200 students each and an 80-student Experience-Based Career Education component. Each vocational cluster contains both prime sponsor and school system staff. Maximum integration is provided between academic offerings and work experience. Vocational offerings are reviewed by a labor advisory committee to assure relevance to available private sector jobs in Baltimore.

Harbor City students must be eligible for CETA Title I (and more recently YETP) and read at a 5.5 grade level or higher, and be able to graduate within two years. (Other programs exist for the functionally illiterate, etc.) Students must meet certain academic and department standards to remain in the program and superior performance is publicly recognized. (Discipline is handled by a student-faculty committee.)

Harbor City offers both a regular high school diploma and a GED. A waiver was received from the State Department of Education to offer the GED program to persons who have been out of school for less than two years. Students who complete the GED program are allowed full-time work experience until the end of the school year.

> The development of the Harbor City Learning program was not without problems. When the program was first announced, the local press questioned the social justice of serving dropouts and truants. Finding the right teachers and administrators was and is still difficult. Harbor City has had four principals in five years; teachers who are turned off by the traditional school are not necessarily right for an alternative education setting. Mixing school and manpower staff under a single director has caused divided loyalties, the "who evaluates me, who pays me" syndrome. The awarding of academic credit by noncredited, nonschool system staff required time to develop and the permission of the State Department of Education.

Collaboration takes time, but institutional changes can occur. The collaborative process can work; academic coursework and work experience can be integrated. Baltimore has seen many dropouts receive diplomas through Harbor City. The attendance rate is far higher than in the general school population.

In the discussion period, the groups considered a range of items, although considerable emphasis was on processes and the difficulties of achieving changes in short periods of time. It was generally concluded that the biggest gain that could be made this year was to get a start either by expanding quality efforts already in place or by taking the first steps to develop new ones. The fact that some prime sponsors had already achieved creative and productive linkages served to prompt others to recognize that YEDPA could in fact be a catalyst for institutional change.

A number of other issues tended to pervade these seminars. First, both prime sponsors and LEAs questioned who had the "upper hand" in negotiations. To this, there is no clear-cut answer. In some sense, the prime sponsor can specify certain basic parameters and thus has the ascendent role. The prime sponsor may require, for example, that LEAs adhere to certain limitations it has placed on itself, such as the percentage of funds that might be available for administrative expenditures.

The bottom line is, however, that both must work together. Neither the prime sponsor nor the LEA has access to at least 22 percent of the YETP funds without an agreement.

Many questions were raised about how the private sector can be involved. This proved to be a difficult problem with no clear answers. On-the-job training remains the basic tool, since private sector wage subsidy is not permitted under YETP and YCCIP. Some areas have active school-to-work or similar councils. The State of California appeared to have a particularly well-defined and productive council. The National Manpower Institute might be able to assist prime sponsors in setting up local councils. Some wage subsidy experiments are being implemented through the YIEPP and other discretionary programs. Further, new interest in private sector initiatives is being generated by the President. Even without councils, however, prime sponsors should at a minimum be involving the business sector in identifying occupations of growth in the labor market and in helping develop curricula that they would find acceptable.

Questions were also raised about how to measure success. There was no closure on this point, and it was obvious that more assistance is needed in this regard. The general feeling was that the soundest quantifiable goals would probably best be those based on past experience. Developing sound goals thus appeared to be more of an evolutionary process.

Finally, a number of concerns were raised about academic credit. Some prime sponsors indicated that they felt "caught in the middle." According to the legislation, they were to make "appropriate efforts" to arrange for academic credit, but this gave them little clout despite the responsibility. Several requests were made that the language be strengthened; it was indicated, however, that Congress had deliberately been vague and that any more stringent language should not be expected. It was suggested that progress in making arrangements for awarding academic credit for work experience could sometimes be most effectively attained at the State level. Some prime sponsors, e.g., California and the Baltimore consortium, worked successfully with the State Board of Education.

D. Conclusion

Overall, the consensus was that the workshops and seminars served a valuable function for the participants. They facilitated the process of information sharing among prime sponsors and LEAs and helped each understand the other's role under YEDPA. The participants felt that the workshops had provided them a good beginning in the process of developing CETA/LEA agreements. Success in the implementation of these agreements will be tracked by both DOL and DHEW.

II. KEYNOTE SPEECHES

YEDPA: OBLIGATIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICAN EDUCATION*

Dr. Kenneth B. Hoyt, Jr.
Director, Office of Career Education
U.S. Office of Education

Introduction

Since 1960, the ratio of youth to adult unemployment has remained stable at about 3:1. Likewise, the ratio of unemployment among nonwhite youth, as opposed to white youth, has remained at about 2:1. During this same period, underemployment among youth, defined as the number accepting employment at a lower level than that for which they are prepared, has also increased dramatically.

Conscious and conscientious attempts to deal with this problem have been mounted in recent years by various parts of the Department of Labor, by a variety of community-based organizations, and by the formal education system. From a "results" viewpoint, these efforts have not succeeded in altering these ratios. This, of course, does not mean that good and worthwhile things have not been learned nor that youth, in general, have not received assistance.

The Congress, in enacting the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977, recognized the past contributions of these three societal elements by including all of them in the legislation. In doing so, the Congress asked each to: (a) increase the intensity and variety of their actions; and (b) work together rather than separately. When results are assessed, the "bottom line" will be the extent to which the youth/work/schooling problem has been alleviated. The "next-to-the-bottom line" will be the extent to which and the effectiveness with which a true collaborative effort has been initiated.

The purpose of this presentation is to address responsibilities of the formal education system in this collaborative effort. Its basic thesis is that, as education discharges its obligations under YEDPA, a series of opportunities for needed basic structural changes in education will inevitably emerge. While YEDPA, by itself, is not a sufficient <u>reason</u> to change the American education system, it may well become a <u>catalyst</u> for change.

---

*Remarks prepared for presentation at DOL/DHEW YEDPA workshops for CETA Prime Sponsors and LEAs in December 1977 and January 1978.

To defend this thesis, an attempt will first be made to specify obligations of the formal education system found in the YEDPA legislation. This will be followed by a listing of youth needs to be met by the collaborative effort involving the education system. Finally, a series of opportunities for basic educational change growing out of methods required to meet education's obligations will be identified and briefly discussed.

Obligations of Education Found in the YEDPA Legislation

The YEDPA law---P.L. 95-93---identifies specific obligations of education in several places. They can be summarized as follows:

Title I - Young Adult Conservation Corps

1. The Secretary of Labor is required to work with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make suitable arrangements whereby academic credit may be awarded by educational institutions and agencies for competencies derived from work experience. (Sec. 804(e)). This requirement exists in spite of the fact that the formal education system will not be directly involved in providing nor in evaluating training.

2. The Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture may make grants to any public agency or organization for State and/or local programs funded with the 30 percent of funds set aside for State and local programs. (Sec. 806(a)(2)). Public educational institutions qualify for such grants.

Title II, Subpart 1 - Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects

1. The prime sponsor must provide assurances that arrangements have been made with the appropriate LEA that participating in-school youth are enrolled and meeting the minimum academic and attendance requirements of the school. (Sec. 327(a)(4)(K)). LEAs have obvious obligations to supply prime sponsors with these data under clear agreements.

2. The Secretary of Labor must, in his report to the Congress, include data with respect to the degree to which employment opportunities provided have caused out-of-school youth to return to school or others to remain in school. (Sec. 329(3)). LEAs have clear obligations to: (a) devise and implement arrangements for out-of-school youth to return to school; and (b) participate in efforts to encourage in-school youth to remain in school.

3. The prime sponsor must provide assurances that consultation has been held with public and private nonprofit educational agencies including vocational and postsecondary education institutions. (Sec. 327(a)(4)(D)). Educational institutions have an obligation to provide such consultation.

4. Employment opportunities provided youth participating under this subpart may take place in LEAs, institutions of higher education, and other kinds of educational institutions. (Sec. 326(1)). The education system has an obligation to make available some employment opportunities for youth enrolled under this subpart.

Title II, Subpart 2 - Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects

1. The prime sponsor is required to include, in the proposed agreement to conduct such a project, a description of arrangements made with school systems---including school cooperative programs. (Sec. 336(b)(1)). Educators have an obligation to work with prime sponsors in making such arrangements.

2. The prime sponsor is required to describe plans for coordinating the training and work experience with school-related programs, including awarding academic credit. (Sec. 336(b)(2)). Educators have an obligation to participate in forming and carrying out these plans.

3. Projects are required to be conducted in such a manner as to permit participating in-school youth to coordinate their jobs with classroom instruction. (Sec. 337(b)(2)). Educators have a responsibility to arrange school schedules---and the school day---in ways that make such coordination workable and effective.

Title II, Subpart 3 - Youth Employment and Training Program

1. The program for in-school youth, under this subpart, must be administered, under contracts with the prime sponsor, by an LEA, a consortium of LEAs, or by a postsecondary educational institution. (Sec. 346(c)(2)). Educators have an obligation to administer such efforts.

2. The program for in-school youth may include a variety of school-to-work transition services for all youth, ages 16-21 as well as special work experience programs for economically disadvantaged youth. (Sec. 345(a)(2)). Educators have an obligation to plan for implementing programs of both types.

3. Economically disadvantaged in-school youth participating in this subpart are to be selected by the educational institution based on certification made by school-based guidance counselors. (Sec. 346(c)(6)). Educational institutions have an obligation to perform this selection function and to demonstrate its validity.

4. Not less than 22 percent of the funds available under this subpart must be used for programs for in-school youth under agreements between prime sponsors and LEAs. (Sec. 343(d)). LEAs have an obligation to make sure this 22 percent is a minimum, not a maximum, and to enter into subcontracts with postsecondary education institutions to serve youth in such settings.

5. LEAs are required to secure funds from prime sponsors for use, in part, to employ additional school-based counselors to carry out provisions of this subpart. (Sec. 346(c)(3)). LEAs have an obligation to do so without supplanting currently employed counselors.

6. Special provisions are made to encourage programs to make available employment and career counseling to presecondary youth. (Sec. 348(c)(1)(E)). Educators have an obligation to discover and implement ways of making this a reality.

7. Ten percent of funds available under this subpart may be used for work experience programs for youth from various socioeconomic levels and are not restricted to economically disadvantaged (income-eligible) youth. (Sec. 345(a)). Educators have an obligation to plan for and implement this section of the Act.

8. Youth Councils are to be established under this subpart. (Sec. 346(b)). Educators have an obligation to participate in such youth councils and work constructively with them.

There are, thus, a minimum of 20 legal obligations for education specified in this law. When viewed collectively, they tell us a great deal about what education is to do, but very little about how these obligations are to be met.

Specific Youth Needs Addressed in the YEDPA Legislation

Title II of YEDPA contains references to a variety of youth needs to be met jointly through collaborative efforts of CETA prime sponsors, community-based organizations, and educational institutions. While education is not solely responsible for meeting these needs, it behooves all educators to be aware of their nature. Including both in-school and out-of-school youth, Subpart 1 pertains to needs of economically disadvantaged youth, ages 16-19. Subparts 2 and 3 refer to needs of all youth, ages 16-21, as well as certain additional needs of economically disadvantaged youth. A summary listing of such youth needs for economically disadvantaged youth includes the need to:

Subpart 1:

1. Earn enough money so they can remain in high school
2. Earn enough money so they can return to high school (for dropouts)
3. Find ways of re-entering high school (for dropouts)
4. Discover career-related reasons for completing high school

Subpart 2:

1. Earn money while acquiring specific vocational skills
2. Expand options for vocational skill training beyond those offered by the education system
3. Acquire general employability skills

Subpart 3:

1. Engage in subsidized work experience that will enable them to explore career options and make better career decisions
2. Acquire specific vocational skills
3. Be recipients of transition services called for in this subpart available to all youth

Under Subpart 3, a total of 16 youth needs are identified to be made available to all participating youth, ages 16-21. These include, for example, the need for:

1. Counseling, including career counseling
2. Occupational, educational, and labor market information of a national, State, and local nature
3. Assistance in making the transition from school to work
4. Career exploration in both the public and private sectors
5. Job placement assistance
6. Assistance in combatting race and sex stereotyping as deterrents to full freedom of educational and occupational choice.

These youth needs have been listed for three purposes: (a) to illustrate that they represent needs all three partners in this collaborative effort have been trying to meet for several years; (b) to emphasize that the Act provides a series of new resources and development of approaches to meeting these needs; and (c) to point out once more that these needs are to be met through a collaborative effort.

Opportunities for Needed Educational Change

American education cannot fully meet its YEDPA obligations through its present structure. Change is needed. Such change must be planned and implemented in ways consistent with all basic goals of education and the educational needs of all students. YEDPA provides education with several opportunities for basic change as it seeks to meet its obligations under this Act.

Opportunity 1: To plan and implement ways of utilizing the broader community in the educative process. Several parts of YEDPA contain provisions for in-school youth to utilize the personnel and physical resources of the broader community, as well as those of the education system, in preparing themselves for work. This should be welcomed as an opportunity to use the community as a learning laboratory. Educators have known for years that youth can and do learn in more places than the classroom, in more ways than through reading books, and from more persons than classroom teachers. In this increasingly complex society, we can no longer plan

to duplicate community learning resources within the schoolhouse walls. If we can apply such principles to the business/labor/industry community, we can also apply them for other purposes to such community settings as libraries, museums, art galleries, and community service agencies. Just as students can learn outside of the school building, so, too, can educators. To seize this opportunity would provide educators a means to implement such long-standing educational goals as those found in the extended school day, the distended school, and the year-round school.

Opportunity 2: To learn about and implement new ways of awarding academic credit. Throughout the YEDPA, repeated emphasis is placed on the need to find ways of awarding academic credit for work experience. Since four out of every five high schools already do so, there is nothing new about the concept. What is new is the request that academic credit be awarded for experiences neither supervised nor evaluated by professional educators. On top of this, parts of YEDPA also ask for academic credit to be awarded both for basic academic skills and employability skills acquired through the YEDPA experience.

American education faces serious and inescapable responsibilities both to guarantee the validity of academic credit granted and for assuring that such credits are appropriate to count toward graduation requirements. These responsibilities can be met within the framework of the YEDPA legislation only if planning and implementation efforts in the arena of performance evaluation are stressed. Such efforts must move us away from so great a dependence on the amount of time spent in a classroom as a criterion for credit-counting and toward a greater emphasis on demonstrated performance. Resistance to performance evaluation, as a basis for granting academic credit, has come both because some educational experiences defy pure performance evaluation and because instrumentation for performance evaluation remains imperfect. If the YEDPA legislation can serve to stimulate educators to value, to validate, and to use performance evaluation as a basis for granting academic credit, a significant step will have been taken toward improving our entire system of formal education. The large sums of discretionary knowledge building funds available under YEDPA should help greatly.

Opportunity 3: To provide diversified educational opportunities for students within the framework of an integrated educational system. All three subparts of Title II of YEDPA provide multiple opportunities for special services aimed at helping economically disadvantaged students. It is a direction that is eminently necessary. This is not to say

it is sufficient. We must follow this same principle for all. This, too, represents an opportunity for educational planning and implementation long overdue in American education. The principle under question is what some have described as the "doctrine of fairness" which holds that, to be fair to all students, we must expose all to exactly the same experiences. To those who recognize and value individual differences, it is better known as the "doctrine of unfairness"---i.e., as a doctrine that should be abolished. A true "doctrine of fairness" would demand that, assuming a common core of basic knowledge at what Commissioner Ernest Boyer has described as the "basic school" and "middle school" levels, differing educational opportunities be made available, in the form of both in-school and community educational experiences, for all students. If the YEDPA legislation can stimulate a basic change in American education, especially at the grade 10-12 level, aimed at providing a variety of kinds of "learning to do" and "doing to learn" educational experiences for all students, it will have made a significant contribution.

Opportunity 4: To enhance and protect freedom of career choice. Both Title I and Subparts 1 and 2 of YEDPA's Title II are restrictive in terms of the type of work experience and training opportunities made available to economically disadvantaged youth. The economic rewards resulting from participation may well cause many such youth to narrow their consideration of possible occupational choices to those available under the Act. To avoid this danger, it is essential that educators start planning now to discover ways of helping economically disadvantaged youth whose career goals differ from opportunities available under this Act discover alternative ways of moving toward such career goals.

Once again, education is faced with a stimulus opportunity to change, holding implications for all students. One's career choices profoundly affect the individual's total lifestyle. Such choices have been unduly restricted for many youth on the basis of parental occupation; socio-economic level; occupational stereotyping based on race, sex, and physical handicaps; and, most of all, by inadequate opportunities to engage in career exploration in the occupational society itself. With more than seven out of every ten youth currently enrolled in secondary schools and colleges currently expressing need for more help in career decision-making, the time has surely come to consider this as a challenge for educational planners and decision-makers. The need to plan for and provide multiple opportunities for career exploration for all students is made clear by the special challenges the YEDPA legislation poses for economically disadvantaged students. It is a need that must be met.

Opportunity 5: To relate educational experiences to later lifestyle activities of youth. Title II, Subpart 3, of YEDPA calls for school-based counselors to certify that work experience opportunities are related to career and educational goals of participating students. This, of course, is only the top of the "iceberg" of educational relevancy. Whether or not work experiences are related to educational experiences will, in reality, depend on the degree to which the teaching faculty recognizes the need and possibilities for doing so. Important as counselors obviously are, it is in the classroom, not in the counselor's office, where the student will either experience---or fail to experience---relationships between school subjects and work experience opportunities available under YEDPA.

If YEDPA can stimulate American education to move toward an increased emphasis, in every classroom, on the usefulness of subject matter in both career and other lifestyle activities, great progress will have been made. Such an effort will surely alleviate such current symptoms of educational deficiency as lowered test scores, classroom discipline, and high truancy rates. When both student and teacher can clearly see the usefulness of the subject matter, the general health of American education will surely improve. The key person among professional educators is the classroom teacher. Hopefully, implementation of YEDPA will reinforce this most basic of all educational truths.

Concluding Remarks

It is apparent that the YEDPA legislation addresses a host of youth needs that have been of concern to American education for several years. It is equally apparent that, by calling for a collaborative effort involving other segments of the community also concerned about such youth needs, the odds of meeting such needs are enhanced.

The YEDPA legislation clearly calls for the active and deep involvement of professional educators. The obligations of educators contained in this legislation cannot be fully met unless some basic changes are made in the system of education. This legislation can serve as a catalyst for stimulating such changes in directions that will enhance the quality of education. It is an opportunity that must not be missed and a challenge that must be met.

PROMOTING COOPERATION AMONG THE EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING COMMUNITIES UNDER YEDPA*

Dr. Robert Taggart
Administrator, Office of Youth Programs
Employment and Training Administration
U.S. Department of Labor

It is clearly the intent of Congress---and I believe, a well-directed one---that there be close coordination between the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at the Federal and local levels under the youth efforts. The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act provides the resources and mandate for such coordination.

But coordination is a means not an end, and it is important to first determine, and agree upon, goals before launching any collaborative efforts. In broad outline at least, it is quite clear what Congress ultimately intended under YEDPA and I think we can agree on the value of these aims.

First, the law envisions an individualized, comprehensive approach to aid youth in the school-to-work transition. A wide range of services are to be provided under YEDPA in-school programs, and these are to be tailored to the interests and abilities of each youth, with careful consideration of labor market realities.

Second, the Act envisions a continuity and coordination of services which does not now exist in many cases. The idea is to link in-school jobs with summer jobs in a carefully structured program, and to enrich all jobs with other types of assistance.

Third, the Act seeks to improve available services. In particular, it focuses on the goal of making work experience more meaningful. It was Congress' belief that previous work efforts had in many cases become disguised income transfer programs, which did not even provide supervision, much less career-related skills. Another emphasis is on improving occupational information and its delivery.

Fourth, YEDPA encourages a closer tie between the content of education and work programs so that what is learned at the job site and in vocational classes supports and is supported by what is learned in the academic classroom.

---

*Remarks prepared for DOL/DHEW YEDPA workshops for CETA prime sponsors and local education agencies in December 1977 and January 1978.

Fifth, the Act seeks to encourage school completion and to attract youth who have dropped out back to school to complete their educations and to secure the high school credential.

Sixth, YEDPA hopes to provide every youth with the information needed to make wise career decisions. The emphasis on improved occupational information is one manifestation. Another is the effort to overcome sex stereotyping. Also, there is a desire to improve occupational counseling.

The Act mandates a number of specific linkages between the education and employment and training systems in order to achieve these objectives.

1. Under the Youth Employment and Training Programs segment of YEDPA which distributes $537 million to State and local governments for comprehensive youth services, 22 percent of funds are designated specifically for in-school youth. These funds can only be spent under the terms of an agreement between the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act's prime sponsor which administers DOL funds, and the local education agency. The LEA-CETA agreement is a chance to assess the activities of the schools and prime sponsors locally, and to try to link them together in a rational fashion.

2. The Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects program, Subpart I of YEDPA, with a $115 million allocation, seeks to test the effects and feasibility of guaranteeing jobs to disadvantaged youth who are in school or agree to return to school. One issue is whether enough jobs can be created or secured for youth who may want them. A second is the number of job-takers, and, thus, the costs of Entitlement. It is, for instance, unknown how many dropouts will return to school if jobs are assured. If youth do return or refrain from leaving, the fundamental question is whether this will improve their future employability.

3. YEDPA requires in all its programs that academic credit be arranged where feasible for work experience. This applies under both YACC (Young Adult Conservation Corps) and YCCIP. The aims are to help youth finish school and to link what they learn on the job to what they can learn in the classroom.

4. Linkages are also mandated in the collection and delivery of occupational information. YEDPA provides funds to the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, which will in turn use them to support State Occupational Information Coordinating Committees. By design, these bodies include balanced representatives of education and labor institutions.

In seeking to implement these specific mandates, the broader aim of coordination, and the ultimate goal of better programs for youth, it is important to recognize some of the obstacles.

1. The first is, of course, the necessarily rapid pace of implementation. YEDPA seeks institutional changes and careful experimentation, but it is also part of an economic stimulus package. We are under constant pressure to move as rapidly as possible. Obviously, this does not leave time to do all the foundation building and thinking we would like. Also, the one-year authorization for the programs does not help.

2. Second, we are being asked to do many things which we do not know how to best accomplish. This is especially true in the Department of Labor where we know very little about such subjects as academic credit and in-school career counseling. But all of us are uncertain when it comes to such subjects as LEA-CETA agreements. This approach has never been tried before except in a few isolated areas.

3. Third, we do not have the leverage or mandate to achieve specific institutional changes. For instance, while the award of academic credit is mandated, there are a variety of approaches and we have neither the knowledge, desire, nor authority to choose between them in our regulations. Our employment and training system is largely decentralized, and we must leave a wide degree of flexibility in light of varying local conditions. Finally, the money is not adequate to provide leverage for many changes. Only $118 million of the first $1 billion is mandated to be spent on in-school youth under the LEA-CETA agreement. Spread over 16,000 LEAs, this will not buy much in the way of change.

We do not, then, see these new programs as the cutting edge of institutional change. Rather, they are a way of recognizing and promoting innovative approaches already ongoing, and further encouraging linkages which have been building. The LEA-CETA agreement, for instance, will hopefully be a forum for thinking through issues of mutual concern to schools and the employment and training system, but most of all to youth. In fact, YEDPA is simply another step in a continuing process. The growth of cooperative education programs, the work study, and career education thrusts have already done much to break down the barriers between school and work. The cross-fertilization of advisory councils has been useful. YEDPA provides the resources for further progress down this road.

To make this work, then, we cannot rely on prescriptive regulations or huge monetary incentives. Rather, we must rely on good will and collaboration based on agreement over the ends to be achieved.

The Department of Labor is doing everything it can to assure this collaboration and we have had excellent cooperation from DHEW and from organizations such as yours.

I would like to mention some of the specific actions to date.

1. In the regulations, we have tried to carry forward the Congressional aims without being so specific that the procedures bog down the system in red tape. We have provided extra time after the submission of the plan for the development of an LEA-CETA agreement in order to assure that this document is not rushed. One of the controversial issues to date has been the definition of LEAs which we used. It does not include junior or community colleges. Our thinking was that prime sponsors should be forced to at least sit down with the public schools rather than avoiding them by going to the community colleges. We are not discouraging activities with these institutions and expect that with the other 78 percent of funds these can be financed. But we certainly want to achieve public school-CETA linkages as a minimum.

2. Under the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects program, we ran national competition rather than using the Secretary's discretion and merely selecting a few demonstration sites. Competitive procedures are much more difficult, but we believe they are worth the effort, not just because they are fair, but because they help to achieve greater coordination. One of every three prime sponsors submitted an application. While their submissions varied in quality, almost all reflected interaction between the prime sponsor and the school system---much more interaction than had been achieved in the past. Even if most were not selected for Entitlement projects, the application provided a planning base for other local YEDPA efforts.

3. We have worked closely with DHEW on a number of issues. A memorandum of understanding has been agreed to which establishes a joint working committee, procedures for identifying and supporting model programs, arrangements for developing and disseminating technical assistance materials, and agreements to support this set of regional conferences bringing the local education and employment and training decision-makers together.

4. We have sought to use our discretionary funds under YEDPA to further the collaboration process. On the broadest scale, we have set aside $15 to $20 million for incentive grants to localities for model in-school programs of the type envisioned under the YETP 22 percent set-aside. A precondition for the grant is a workable LEA-CETA agreement. Rather than using the stick of detailed regulations, we have, therefore, used the carrot. Details on this grant program will be made available shortly when the dust settles on current planning processes.

We are also using discretionary funds to support a demonstration of alternative career education approaches outside the schools. DOL is working jointly with NIE on this activity. We are supporting a number of work education councils and providing the wherewithal for other prime sponsors to follow the model. There will be a structured demonstration testing the comparative effectiveness of alternative school-to-work transition service approaches and delivery agents. And funds are transferred to NOICC for improvements in career information and its delivery.

5. We have sought to let everyone know what we are doing and why, so that no one is dealt out of the action because of the lack of information. Our first step was to prepare a Program Planning Charter explaining our interpretations and intents. We have prepared a Knowledge Development Plan detailing the allocations of discretionary funds and what we hope to learn. We have also prepared A Monitoring and Assessment Plan and a Technical Assistance Plan, as well as a continuously updated set of questions and answers related to the regulations. The Charter was distributed publicly in September; the other materials were all made available recently to prime sponsors and to any other interested parties. Education groups will be able to secure them through DHEW. This is really an experiment to see what happens if you try to plan from the start and to explain everything to the public.

Additionally, we are preparing a range of technical assistance materials. Some of these are a joint product with DHEW. A short guide on academic credit is currently available. An outline of the elements of LEA-CETA agreements is to be completed very soon.

I think you will agree that this represents a comprehensive effort to achieve collaboration between the education and employment and training systems. The success of these ventures depends on several things:

First, everyone must realize that we are moving into uncharted seas. We in the Office of Youth Programs will make many mistakes and we will have our blind spots. I think it is important to take these in stride. Likewise, tolerance is needed at the local level.

Second, we must realize that the current arrangements are not fixed in concrete. Congress is trying to discover how to best achieve its aims, and YEDPA is not the answer but rather a knowledge development tool. We should not exaggerate shortcomings or minimize successes when it later comes to altering arrangements.

Third, we ought not get tied up in turf battles. This does not mean that education should not push for every penny it can get. DHEW, in fact, prepared a list of proposed joint ventures that would have transferred all the discretionary resources and more. Yet after we carefully assessed what was and was not feasible, we have managed to pull together extremely well.

Finally, we have to have some patience. While it is certainly appropriate for Congress to ask us what has been done to achieve coordination, and to express its concern, we must wait for a time to assess the outcome of the process.

Overall, however, I am encouraged about the prospects. The DHEW linkages have been surprisingly effective. Secretary Marshall and other top decision-makers in the Department of Labor have stressed interagency linkages and are deeply concerned that we work closely with the education system. The response of the prime sponsors to the Entitlement competition indicates a willingness and ability for local education and employment and training systems to work together. There will be many problems ahead. But I pledge the best effort of the Department of Labor to make collaboration a reality so that we can substantially reduce the barriers between school and work, as well as between education and employment institutions.

III. SUMMARIES OF INDIVIDUAL SEMINARS HELD AT FIVE YEDPA WORKSHOPS

The brainstorming strategy known as Phillips 66 was used to elicit problems, concerns, and recommendations from the workshop groups. The Phillips 66 method has particular characteristics for which it was selected and used for the YEDPA workshop seminars. The characteristics for which it was selected are: (1) it is most useful in meetings where the participants all have expertise and knowledge with respect to the problems under consideration, and (2) it works best when used with people who are at the operational level.

The Phillips 66 method is ideal for situations where it is believed participants have more to gain from listening to their colleagues than from "outside experts."

Department of Labor and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare personnel jointly drew up the questions for each seminar topic. Participants had an opportunity to review these questions before each seminar. Each of the seminars had a DOL and/or DHEW representative who could clarify questions and provide feedback, whenever possible, as well as carry participants' ideas, suggestions, and concerns back to representatives of the participating agencies. All participants' schedules were arranged so that each could attend a seminar on each of the four topics.

Phillips 66 highlights the process of sharing. It was hoped that all participants would benefit from the collection of ideas available from their colleagues.

Dingle Associates, Inc. is indebted to the following individuals who contributed extensive notes and/or write-ups on the seminar sessions:

A. Dallas Workshop

1. Implementing YEDPA ..... Joseph A. Hines
2. Work Experience ..... Walter Rambo
3. Career Development ..... E. Neil Carey
4. Academic Credit ..... Ed Coleman

B. San Diego Workshop

1. Implementing YEDPA ..... Joseph A. Hines
2. Work Experience ..... Jack P. Sappington
3. Career Development ..... Arvin C. Blome
4. Academic Credit ..... Vincent D. Barry

C. Boston Workshop

1. Implementing YEDPA ..... Joseph A. Hines
2. Work Experience ..... Donald E. Beineman
3. Career Development ..... John E. Radvany
4. Academic Credit ..... Al McKinnon

D. Atlanta Workshop

1. Implementing YEDPA ..... Joseph A. Hines
2. Work Experience ..... Don Eisinger
3. Career Development ..... John F. Standridge
4. Academic Credit ..... Richard Campbell

E. Cincinnati Workshop

1. Implementing YEDPA ..... Joseph A. Hines
2. Work Experience ..... Jim Smith
3. Career Development ..... Richard Jackson
4. Academic Credit ..... Edwin E. Cain

A. Dallas Workshop (December 12-13, 1977)

1. Implementing YEDPA Seminars

NOTE: Because the Implementing YEDPA sessions were conducted in lecture style at all five workshops and because their basic content remained the same, the following composite report has been prepared, synthesizing the major points of all five workshops, representing 20 seminar sessions.

Each workshop on Implementing YEDPA began with a briefing for participants on the legislative history of the Act (P.L. 95-93). As set forth in the pertinent Congressional literature distributed to participants, YEDPA seeks to meet the critical demand for youth employment, not only by supporting local demonstration efforts, but also by creating immediate job opportunities for unemployed youth.

The mandate for a collaborative undertaking by manpower and education personnel was identified as a key feature of the legislation. Furthermore, the written agreement between prime sponsors and local education agencies (LEAs) was noted as the foundation of its potential success. In addition, the built-in flexibility in reaching these agreements was emphasized as a significant contribution in furthering the dual objectives of YEDPA.

While stressing the importance of a solid foundation for realizing the full intent of YEDPA, workshop leaders referred to the need for each written agreement to be seen as a beginning, not an end.

Presenters informed participants that all indications point to FY 1979 funding for YEDPA programs and, therefore, continuation of existing prime sponsor/LEA agreements. Thus, it seems evident that the opportunity exists for improving coordination and strengthening current linkages.

In addition to Department of Labor staff, personnel representing local education and manpower agencies were on hand to participate in discussions on Implementing YEDPA. By offering participants their past experiences as examples, these presenters provided a well-rounded perspective on the possibilities that exist in solving the youth unemployment rate. Problems posed by the employment situation surfaced as did evidence that YEDPA may well act as a catalyst for educational change.

Based on many years of experience in developing innovative projects with the Flint (Michigan) School System, one presenter offered Dallas participants his personal reasons for expecting YEDPA to have a positive impact.

With funds supplied by the Mott Foundation, which was established forty years ago by a former President of General Motors to support educational innovation, the Flint School System has had an ongoing opportunity to initiate changes with benefits accruing directly to school youth. The system's chance to observe demonstration programs has indeed underscored the importance of schools' adaptability in meeting each student's needs; this is especially so for those students whose educational attainments are likely to be effectively limited by economic or cultural factors.

This presenter emphasized that everyone has a right to the benefits of the school system. In shaping a new opportunity for making schools more responsive, he commented, YEDPA can provide every student true equal access to the benefits of the educational system and help fulfill that individual right.

From a prime sponsor's perspective, one Dallas workshop presenter stated that, although their agreement was signed by the prime sponsor and the school system, the private sector and community-based organizations are very visible partners in their written agreement.

The initiative for this full collaboration was a school desegregation order prior to YEDPA's passage. Although working relationships had existed between the school system and private industry and, likewise, between CETA and community-based organizations, it was not until the desegregation order that the four groups came together as one. When YEDPA was passed, Dallas was already on its way in establishing close relationships among the major segments of the community which serve youth. The fruits of this collaboration were evident not only in the amount of private sector participation in the YIEPP proposal, but also in the fact that the proposal could be produced under severe time constraints.

The implementation of YEDPA has implications for prime sponsors and LEAs alike. Past attempts at collaboration between agencies have highlighted sources of difficulty such as coordination, communication, and perceived threats to agency "turf." The fact is, however, that this hindsight can benefit current CETA/LEA efforts to recognize specific problem areas and address them in their written agreements.

One presenter was able to isolate some of the issues that, in his experience, have made collaboration difficult in the past, along with those aspects of YEDPA which he feels will foster CETA/LEA collaboration. After presenting aspects on both sides of the issue, this presenter offered the following objectives as important to fulfilling YEDPA's goals: (1) collaboration must build local support and involve the private sector more heavily; (2) evaluation must go beyond the traditional "numbers game;" (3) experimentation with a mix of both low- and high-income youth must be encouraged; (4) overall, YEDPA programs must have sufficient lead time for planning; and (5) YEDPA programs must be granted sufficient time to fully determine their effectiveness and to institutionalize positive changes within school systems.

A Case Study

The fact that some prime sponsors had already achieved creative and productive linkages served to prompt participants to recognize that YEDPA could in fact be a catalyst for institutional change. Representatives of the Harbor City Learning program in Baltimore, Maryland, presented a case study of how the collaborative process worked as prime sponsors and LEAs jointly addressed Baltimore's dropout and truancy problems which had reached epidemic proportions.

Harbor City Learning is a Baltimore Public High School program operated by the school system under contract to the Baltimore CETA prime sponsor. At first, the school system contributed one principal---now the school system contributes one principal, two vice-principals, 44 teachers, and several clerical staff; this amounts to an in-kind contribution of $650,000 annually. Because the city did not wish to promote two competing school systems, the existing school system, rather than the prime sponsor, operates Harbor City even though the funding is primarily CETA income.

Based on a needs assessment survey, Baltimore planners originally learned that most students dropped out for three basic reasons: (1) the nonrelevancy of the traditional school curriculum; (2) the lack of recognition of individual needs (class sizes averaged 30 to 50); and (3) economic pressures.

Harbor City Learning addressed each of these needs. First, Harbor City was created as an alternative education program integrating classroom instruction with career education and work experience. Second, the class size was reduced to 15 (later increased to 18). However, since

students attend class for two weeks and work for two weeks, the effective teacher-pupil ratio is 1 to 30 or 36 which is in keeping with traditional schools. Third, students receive 60 hours of work experience per month. Allowances are not paid for classroom instruction.

The Harbor City program operates throughout the entire year on a trimester basis. The "out-of-school" program consists of five vocational clusters of 200 students each and an 80-student Experience-Based Career Education component. Each vocational cluster contains both prime sponsor and school system staff. An advisory committee reviews vocational offerings and assures their relevance to available private sector jobs in Baltimore.

Harbor City provides for maximum integration of academic offerings and work experience; it offers both a regular high school diploma and a GED. Students who complete the GED program are allowed full-time work experience until the end of the school year. (It was necessary to obtain a waiver from the State Department of Education to offer the GED program.)

To be eligible for the Harbor City program, students have to be eligible for CETA Title I (and more recently YETP), read at least at a 5.5 grade level, and be able to graduate within two years. Students must meet certain academic and department standards to remain in the program. Discipline is handled by a student-faculty committee and superior performance is publicly recognized.

The development of the Harbor City Learning program has not been without problems, although the partnership between the prime sponsor and the school system has been greatly aided by the local government structure. In Baltimore, both the school superintendent, who is chosen by an appointed school board, and the manpower director are members of the Mayor's Cabinet. This organization helps to reduce jurisdictional friction.

Even so, institutional support for Harbor City Learning has developed slowly but steadily. When the program was first announced, for instance, the local press questioned the social justice of serving dropouts and truants. Finding the right teachers and administrators (Harbor City has had four principals in five years) has also been difficult. One important lesson learned thus far, perhaps surprisingly, is that teachers who are turned off by the traditional school are not necessarily right for an alternative education setting.

Some other significant constraints encountered over the years have included the "who evaluates me, who pays me" syndrome which, when school and manpower staff are under a single director, can cause divided loyalties. And finally, the permission of the State Department of Education was required in order for nonschool system (noncredentialed) staff to be able to award academic credit.

While the representatives of the Harbor City Learning program stressed that LEA/prime sponsor collaboration takes time, they also reported evidence that institutional change can occur, that the collaborative process can work, and that academic and work experience can be integrated. The fact is that Baltimore has seen many dropouts receive a diploma through Harbor City and that, in fact, the attendance rate is far higher than that within the general school population.

By focusing on the process of prime sponsor/LEA collaboration, the workshop on Implementing YEDPA afforded participants a well-rounded perspective of the problems along with examples of actual operations. These discussions allowed participants to clarify the process of developing an agreement as well as to consider their respective roles and the roles of other community agencies in providing the services required.

A number of issues surfaced which received more concentrated attention in the three other workshops on Academic Credit, Work Experience, and Career Development. A sampling of these included:

> Collaboration - In fulfilling the intent of YEDPA, both the LEA and the prime sponsor must be involved in fully understanding community conditions especially as they relate to youth services; they must reach joint agreement on whom they want to serve; and each must identify its role and understand the roles of the other(s) involved. Finally, all must agree on standards/criteria against which they can judge performance in a mutually constructive way.
>
> The "Upper Hand" - Although in some sense the prime sponsor can specify certain basic parameters in negotiations, neither the prime sponsor nor the LEA has access to at least 22 percent of the YETP funds without an agreement. The bottom line is, therefore, that both must work together. Impasses may require a third party's involvement such as the Regional Office.

Private Sector Involvement - At a minimum, prime sponsors should be involving the business sector in identifying occupations of growth in the labor market and in helping develop acceptable curricula. While active councils exist in some areas, others can look forward to the results of some experimental wage subsidy plans and the new interest in private sector initiatives being generated by President Carter for some assistance in resolving this issue.

The Measure of Success - It seemed obvious that more assistance was needed in goal-setting and measuring success. Probably the soundest quantifiable goals would be those based on experience which had evolved over time.

Academic Credit - Prime sponsors expressed misgivings about their mandate to make "appropriate efforts" to arrange for academic credit without also being afforded the clout necessary to fulfill this responsibility. Based on the successes reported by several participants, however, it was suggested that progress in arranging for academic credit for work experience might be most effectively attained at the State level.

2. Work Experience Seminars

It became clear throughout the Dallas workshop's four seminars on Work Experience that integrating community resources was viewed as an integral component of the implementation plan. In fact, each seminar identified community resources as a major contributor and collaborator to YEDPA's success.

Certain other issues also emerged with some consistency in discussions. These touched on the interpretation of the rules and regulations affecting work experience activities, the initiation and carrying out of these activities, and the role of regular instructional staff relative to the youths' work experiences.

It was the consensus of seminar participants that the fundamental goal of full employment for disadvantaged youth required commitment from both the business community and education. However, making it work most advantageously raised several specific issues which received their immediate attention. Discussions led participants to identify several of these issues to be:

- duplication of job slots with existing vocational programs
- subsidies for on-the-job training
- determination of responsibilities for securing job sites
- analysis of the potential learning at a job site by either LEA or CETA
- determination of the priority for placement in either public nonprofit organizations or profit-making businesses
- formalization of relationships between education and business.

Several participants expressed concern that work experience programs would upset cooperative vocational programs, especially if resources were applied to subsidizing work stations. In a similar vein, concerns were expressed that work experience programs might adversely affect a youth's educational possibilities and skills learning potential; that is, they might offer a "watered down" version of course content as a means of attracting disadvantaged students and, in doing so, result in a mass exodus from the more rigorous regular school curriculum; or, on the other hand, they might fail to develop a rigorous skills training portion of the program---one consisting only of menial tasks---and thereby not develop salable job entry skills in youth. One of the strongest recommendations for averting either of these possibilities was directed at the public schools.

There were two aspects to the recommendations for schools in implementing work experience activities. The first related to the need to strengthen their already functional work experience programs. It was felt that validated approaches (such as Experience-Based Career Education) must be sought which meet needs that traditionally are not dealt with in vocational education programs. Secondly, there was recognition of the importance, to those participating in the work experience programs, of involving the classroom teachers responsible for academic areas. This involvement, it was felt, must begin early on in the development of the program and must aim to develop a faculty's demonstrated capabilities to relate courses to the world of work with regard to values, skills, and content.

While expression of the need for precise interpretation of YEDPA's rules and regulations varied among those in the seminars, there was consensus that the regulations were a source of constraints on start-up time. Agreement was also reached in calling for clear-cut LEA/CETA agreements to identify coordination of in-school and community resources.

Even though participants in the Work Experience seminars did not all use the same vocabulary, each had his/her own insights, ideas, and problem-solving techniques to apply to the group's considerations. The seminars were seen as facilitating communication between project operators and practitioners about common concerns---a goal for the workshop which the participants reported had certainly been met.

3. Career Development Seminars

How to best provide the desired "mix" of education, training, and work and give young people jobs now as first steps toward successful life-career patterns was the overriding theme of the seminars on Career Development. Acknowledging that ideal solutions to youth unemployment may be many years away, participants felt that their opportunity for dialogue in these seminars may well have shortened that waiting time.

With regard to the career development aspect of YEPDA, participants tackled some pressing concerns with the result that they framed strong statements of agreement on certain features of the career development effort.

Discussions highlighted, among other points, the issue of cooperation. Going beyond the need for cooperation between the school and the community, which participants pointed out was explicit in the law, they emphasized the need, less explicitly stated, for cooperation among school people---between teachers and counselors, and academic and vocational educators. In according equal importance to this "cooperation within," participants further clarified the objective of seeking a critical "mix" of personnel for enacting YEDPA.

Another career development concern emphasized in discussions was job placement---the visible "payoff" of YEDPA. This important program operation was understood as depending critically not only on assuring access to the maximum number of job openings, but on achieving quality coordination and information exchange between schools and postsecondary institutions as well as finding qualified, trained staff to carry it out.

In the participants' view, the effectiveness of the placement function directly relates to the availability of accurate and up-to-date career and occupational information, including information about job openings. Many workshop participants expressed concern at the lack of usable and up-to-date information; several people also expressed particular disappointment that neither has the Department of Labor program, which funded eight statewide information systems, been expanded, nor have the States been required to set up similar systems as a part of their overall CETA responsibilities.

Participants did, however, acknowledge the role that existing Career Resource Centers, found in school libraries or guidance offices, could play if they were expanded. It was suggested that these centers, which use existing facilities and materials, could be even more effective if expanded to job bank systems or depositories of computerized career information. It was reported that such centers are already operating and are being used increasingly by CETA clients and supported by CETA prime sponsors; once organized, it was pointed out, such centers can serve the entire community in addition to the targeted student population.

Participants also expressed the strong feeling that the private sector can and should make key contributions to the implementation of YEDPA. Precedents exist for this involvement---programs like 70,001,EBCE, Adopt-a-School, The McCormick Plan---and both prime sponsors and LEAs should be familiar with the successes and potential problems associated with the use of such resources.

It was further agreed that the private sector's (business-industry-labor's) involvement must be activated in the planning stages for implementing the Act. With early collaboration and careful use of such resources, communities should benefit from sufficient paid and nonpaid work experience sites, career exploration settings, and job openings for the community's youth.

Participants further agreed that an unfortunate trend (occurring because of the urgency of the law) was the low priority being given to 14- and 15-year-olds. In their opinion, the failure to support programs for this age bracket, albeit debatable in terms of short-term gains, would simply mean paying a larger price later.

As discussions pointed out, many 14- and 15-year-olds already have biased and stereotyped attitudes toward the world of work. At the same time, however, they are ready to explore careers, take field trips, talk to workers,

and in other ways begin to develop the attitudes, skills, and knowledge necessary to make employment choices. Participants agreed that this age group should not be ignored with regard to career development efforts.

Discussions highlighted another critical goal of the Act, one which is intended to pervade every phase from career exploration to placement---reversing bias and stereotyping in the working society. Several studies have indicated that such activities start early (as early as the second or third grade), which means that preventing their continued reinforcement should be of prime concern to any career awareness program. It was suggested that extensive use of role models, advocates, and peer counselors could be very effective in reversing this trend.

A final issue taken up by participants was the Youth Advisory Councils for which the Act makes specific provision. Seminar participants agreed that the purpose of these councils cannot be underestimated. Seizing the opportunity to make use of youth's contributions through peer counseling and tutoring, for example, LEAs and prime sponsors should find that youth can be an effective constituency for realizing the Act's goals.

4. Academic Credit Seminars

As with those on Work Experience and Career Development, the seminars on Academic Credit reaffirmed the collaborative nature of YEDPA. In unequivocal terms, Dallas conference attendees agreed that any system for identifying competencies; choosing methods by which credits will be awarded; and documenting awarded credits should materialize by joint action of education, business, labor, and other community agencies.

It was suggested that initiating a stong orientation program for the total community would be significant in the long-run stability of viable youth programs. This translates to a need for enhancing awareness and involving not only students and teachers in the planning and maintenance of such programs but also parents, community-based organizations, and local businesses.

The value of this extended involvement was particularly emphasized with regard to the validity of credits earned in alternative learning experiences. Realizing the possibility that a youth's school degree, resulting even in part from alternative experiences, could adversely affect his/her future employment, participants agreed that total community involvement is the key to minimizing that possibility.

The validity of these credits, certainly, is further strengthened by careful attention to the outlined competencies and their measurement. Participants were in agreement that (1) to be certified for competency, skills must relate to marketable skills or skills recognized as needed by the labor market; and (2) worksite supervisors should be well aware of the competencies to be developed and understand the system by which academic credit will be awarded for these competencies. They also advised that each supervisor be regularly apprised of students' progress.

The award and use of credits should also meet certain conditions: (1) a system for awarding academic credit should be designed to facilitate the award of the high school diploma; (2) credit award should be tied to a requirement that regular grades must not decline during participation in these youth employment programs; (3) academic credit should be used toward postsecondary requirements rather than toward a postsecondary degree; and (4) academic credit should be awarded to out-of-school youth.

Given the complexity of YEDPA, the prime sponsors and LEAs in attendance felt positive about this opportunity for exchanging ideas and concerns. And, as a result, they used this seminar to develop several recommendations for continuing communication and collaboration. The following summarize the key recommendations that resulted from the workshop sessions:

- that a national definition of and guidelines for granting academic credit should be developed and written in language that is understandable to both CETAs and LEAs

- that a full-time staff person from an LEA should be assigned as liaison between the two agencies (rather than overburdening a member of a school's staff)

- that prime sponsors and LEAs should collectively and collaboratively present to State and Federal legislatures problems and other experiences that could impact on future national legislation.

B. San Diego Workshop (December 15-16, 1977)

1. Implementing YEDPA Seminars

See the composite report on Implementing YEDPA, beginning on page 41.

2. Work Experience Seminars

Participants of the San Diego seminars highlighted two commitments that should prevail in the development of work experience activities. First, they agreed that solutions to problems should be sought within the existing system to the fullest extent possible; instead of inventing new systems of work experience, attention should be directed to what exists and, when necessary, it should be modified to fit special conditions. Secondly, participants stressed the need to foster the cooperative atmosphere among LEAs, prime sponsors, and participants in every aspect of YEDPA implementation.

Participants declared that a common definition of work experience would settle confusions which produce problems between prime sponsors and LEAs. It appeared that educators had a precedent for granting credit for work experience based upon long-established criteria which they were reluctant to change. The consensus of the group, however, was that there was no need to change this process but only a need to modify it in order to meet the YEDPA regulations. As participants continued to discuss the issue, they discovered that the problem was not so much one of a wide difference between prime sponsors and LEAs as much as it was one requiring mutual understanding.

The seminar also elicited the point that barriers to cooperation and collaboration are directly related to attitudes; that is, that LEAs and prime sponsors have a mutual problem in appreciating each other's capabilities. Participants suggested that educators need to be convinced that education must be extended beyond the school's walls and helped to understand how the prime sponsors can assist in this process.

On the other hand, prime sponsors must understand that LEAs can solve the problems of disadvantaged youth, given the resources necessary to do so. Prime sponsors should be helped to understand the pressures which have forced educators to put more effort into working with the majority of students and tended to make them ignore the disadvantaged students. The prime sponsors should be aware that they can be helpful by being flexible, patient, and understanding.

Participants agreed that extending services for assessment, diagnosis, and prescription of student needs can be a viable part of the work experience program. If remedial education is needed, career development must go hand-in-hand with work experience.

Although questions were raised which could not be finally settled in the seminars, participants did take the view that each State has exemplary work experience models which, when identified, can be incorporated in a process of sharing experience and expertise to benefit all.

3. Career Development Seminars

Certain issues arose repeatedly in the Career Development seminars held in San Diego. Although they were not unrelated to each other, the main topics discussed focused on transitional services, communications, programs for 14- and 15-year-olds, and career guidance and information.

Participants emphasized the need for providing support for the counselors who will assume active responsibility for the transitional services. CETA funds, they suggested, could be used in a number of ways to offer this support. Among the ways participants suggested the money could be used were to secure aides or otherwise release counselors from their clerical responsibilities; to pay for an extended day or year on contract with existing counselors; or to provide special inservice training for existing counseling staff.

Any type of transitional services within a school will require the full support and commitment of the administrator and staff prior to involvement. A harmonious and effective relationship, it was felt, will also depend on the fact that all participants working with the program---teachers, counselors, and others---should be doing so on a voluntary basis.

A last point raised regarding transitional services was the care required not to destroy established programs or the relationships between existing vocational and career education units within the school. Perhaps the emphasis in YEDPA should be to increase the number of career exploration sites.

One suggestion for meeting the need for constant communication at all levels was that funds be allocated for workshops to bring together all segments of education and prime sponsors. In the participants' opinion, misunderstanding and "turf" battles will continue to pose problems and these

will tend to increase as other groups, like community colleges and vocational schools, enter the program. Since participants in each session felt that suspicion and mistrust will continue as long as neither party is well-acquainted with the other, they advised that an overt effort be made for cooperation and understanding of each other's problems and concerns. Without the communication that can foster such cooperation, participants agreed, students would not benefit from the intent of the law.

On the subject of program activities for 14- and 15-year-olds, San Diego participants expressed the need for guidelines on the relevant rules and regulations. In their opinion it seemed to be not only very important but also possible for existing career education exploration programs to incorporate the younger age group.

On a final issue, participants noted the dilemma facing LEAs and higher education in collecting and using labor market information. Concern was expressed that a composite picture of employment information was difficult but that without it, job placement efforts could miss the mark. This, they felt, was particularly true since rapid technological changes can make some occupational training programs obsolete within four or five years.

4. Academic Credit Seminars

Participants at the San Diego Workshop addressed the many questions related to granting academic credit for work experience under YEDPA. Discussions on these issues focused on questions about the roles of educators, private sector employers, community-based organizations, as well as prime sponsors, in reaching critical decisions.

Each seminar opened by first considering a definition of academic credit; participants generally agreed that academic credit is "credit that would be applicable to high school graduation." This definition was understood to be broader than the idea of academic credit traditionally given for nonacademic subjects such as shop or vocational education.

Participants concurred on the importance of this early planning period and any initial decisions made regarding the competencies that are deserving of academic credit and the ways to assess them. When examples were given of how procedures are already working in some schools, participants noted the great differences between local and State laws and the variety of constraints this necessarily places on

efforts to implement YEDPA. For this reason, participants urged careful planning to assure that competencies are preidentified and the types of credit to be awarded are clearly addressed in the LEA/prime sponsor contract.

It was agreed that credit should be elective, not academic, and that "make-work" jobs were not suitable for credit. Participants also stressed the importance of the site supervisor's role in certifying what the student has learned and in interpreting those competencies in terms of credit. Because of the inconsistencies regarding credit award from one area to the next, participants recommended that the Department of Labor set up a system for disseminating information to all whenever acceptable situations are worked out.

The prime sponsor was identified as responsible for coordinating the subcontracting activity with a postsecondary school. It was agreed throughout the seminars that when subcontracting was to be done, the prime sponsor should contract with the LEA, who in turn will subcontract with the postsecondary institution. In order for this process to be most effective, participants indicated, LEAs and prime sponsors must concentrate on closing the communication gap between them. One suggestion for doing so was to exchange staff between LEAs and prime sponsors and thereby facilitate an understanding of each other's operations.

Although everyone agreed that school boards should be involved in academic credit decisions, there were differing opinions on whether or not credit should be based on employer evaluation or on what the teachers claim are appropriate activities for credit. Questions of assessing and certifying students' competencies also raised different possible approaches; these ranged from the use of paper and pencil tests to employers as monitors.

Performance testing was also discussed as a way of measuring competencies. While some participants expressed the opinion that the state-of-the-art of performance testing leaves much to be desired, others felt it is a most appropriate technique. All agreed, however, that performance testing faced its greatest challenge in involving the public sector. The group felt that the public sector was the most difficult to deal with in terms of developing on-the-job competencies.

A final major topic considered by the workshop participants was the "career employment experience." This discussion revolved around two major agreements: (1) if career employment experiences were to be successful, they

must be incorporated into the traditional school (in a way that improves the present curriculum) and not represent an alternative, and (2) career employment experiences must be related to the student's needs and interests.

Participants further believed that such experiences should begin earnestly for 14- and 15-year-old students. They felt that an individual training plan, arrived at by both the teacher and work site supervisor, would be most useful. Such a plan could consist of a series of activities that would lead the student to the competencies already agreed upon as well as clearly indicate the credit that was deserved. Exactly where the competency is developed was not a major concern to participants; the important concern was that the student master the competency.

Participants expressed their concern over the uncertainty of funding and other Federal support forthcoming in the next few years. They also worried that employers might be opposed to having students at work sites for short career exploratory activities as opposed to assuming more productive involvement in their work forces. Will educators be reluctant to have noneducators involved in decisions? Will noneducators be opposed to having educators intrude in the work place? These were some of the questions which remained unresolved when the seminars concluded.

However, participants did offer some specific recommendations as they closed discussions. These included the following:

- The work experience supervisors should be people who have the confidence of both educators and noneducators so that credit granting is respected by each group.
- Teachers should visit work sites to gain first-hand understanding of how work site activities and academic activities are related.
- Programs should impact on the entire student body.
- Whenever possible, YETP programs should be integrated with existing work programs.

C. Boston Workshop (January 9-10, 1978)

1. Implementing YEDPA Seminars

See composite report on Implementing YEDPA, beginning on page 41.

2. Work Experience Seminars

The Work Experience seminars in Boston brought together prime sponsors and LEAs representing a wide variety of individual situations prompting the expression of individual programmatic concerns and concerns with aspects of the overall work experience goals of YEDPA as well. Perhaps this was best reflected in the questions generated by the discussions.

The subject of negotiating agreements with community-based organizations (CBOs) revealed the range of situations that can arise in implementing YEDPA. For instance, areas were represented that have no strong CBOs and, therefore, LEAs and prime sponsors are working with private nonprofit organizations. At the other extreme, one city has thirteen CBOs running their work experience programs; while some encounter a problem in determining what group should be addressed if there is no CBO, others are concerned with how communication can take place when there are several CBOs involved, so that one party is not played off against another.

Concerning the mandate to involve the private (for-profit) sector, a suggestion was made that the Department of Labor should build on the experience LEAs have had with employers for years through the cooperative work-study programs.

Discussions of YCCIP raised several observations within the group: (1) that YCCIP is viewed as an employment rather than a vocational training program; (2) that if YCCIP is to be used as vocational training, the LEA and prime sponsor should jointly develop a "job spec" which can be used to determine the program's success or failure; and (3) that YCCIP remains primarily an out-of-school youth program. While work schedules can usually be adjusted to accommodate those attracted back to school and in-school youth, this program encounters persistent problems with regard to State unemployment compensation and minimum wage laws. Internal problems are created when LEAs are exempt from paying minimum wages to regular employees but must do so for the

students. It was also claimed that in several States, unemployment compensation will be paid these young people upon termination; as a result, the number of possible positions an employer could make available is diminished to provide money to cover payments into the unemployment compensation fund.

With regard to the possibility of YCCIP having an influence on present school-based vocational programs, there was consensus that the lack of specific program elements to provide services plus the insufficient openings to attract out-of-school youth would prove to be major constraints to such a prospect.

When discussions focused on YETP, it was found that, in many cases, work experience agreements had not yet been worked out. Participants did, however, suggest criteria that might generally apply; these included identifying the interests and aptitudes of clients, matching those interests with placement possibilities, requiring that work sites participate in skills training, and having LEAs train work-site supervisors.

Questions were also raised relative to the proposed rotation of students through various work experiences and/or job sites. It concerned participants that program time seems much too short for such rotation and, furthermore, that such a system may heighten insecurity in already insecure youth.

Many questions were raised in this workshop to which answers do not seem readily apparent. This is evident from the following sample of questions left unanswered as the workshop concluded:

- How does a prime sponsor interact with nonpublic schools?
- What is the relationship of YCCIP/YETP to the affective domain? to the handicapped? to youth subcultures?
- How does evaluation take place?

3. Career Development Seminars

The seminars on Career Development generated discussion of a large number of resources that have either been considered or already tapped for use in enacting YEDPA. Addressing many of the related issues of career development for youth, participants raised a number of ideas that all LEAs and prime sponsors could consider applying to their individual settings.

One innovative way described to involve the private sector was the use of a local consortium of college professors and local business firms. The benefits of such a coalition for the students are threefold: (1) testing and real experience are coupled to determine interest; (2) enrollees are trained in a school setting as well as on the job; and (3) by involving unions, students can work with journeymen in the public sector with the goal of graduating into an apprenticeship program. The private sector was also noted for its job sampling opportunities.

Similarly, discussions elicited many suggestions for simulation activities, including interview techniques, volunteerism, explorer scouting techniques, club activities, and community service projects. Participants agreed that simulation was a positive method to use with students as well as being cost-effective, but urged caution with regard to the dichotomy it can produce between actual and classroom activities.

Participants suggested that the gap between school and work could be closed by assuring that counselors become more knowledgeable about diagnostic testing and employment services; just as important, they felt, was that orienting a work-bound student should not fall to the counselor alone, but should be an integrated effort on the part of the teaching faculty (by integrating work-related needs into the curriculum), counselors' supervisors, and CETA staff.

The role of LEAs was also discussed. Specific responsibilities accorded the subcontractor were believed to include:

- transmitting information to students
- orienting students toward career goals
- verifying the eligibility of youth enrolled
- coordinating the activities of counselors and teachers in outreach assessment and orientation.

The fact that schools have limited involvement in job placement activities, prompted participants to emphasize the need for developing linkages with YEDPA.

Another point raised with regard to job placement was the need, at least as the program stabilizes, to increase the number of non-income eligibles.

Participants further agreed that legislative changes may be needed to further clarify activities and programs for 14- and 15-year-olds. Except for the level of sophistication of programs at the occupational level, participants did not feel there were significant differences in career exploration for 14- and 15-year-olds and the older ages. For 16- to 21-year-olds, career exploration should include counseling, the development of job-seeking skills, integration of work skills into the curriculum, and an attempt to eliminate racial and sex stereotyping. It was suggested that mobile vans could be used to carry career exploration programs to outlying areas.

It was apparent that participants had found a number of approaches in attempts to combat sex stereotyping. Some had found it useful to supplement YEDPA activities with the efforts of local and State Equal Opportunity Offices and Human Rights Commissions. Efforts initiated by funds ($50,000) earmarked to create an Office on Women in each State under the Vocational Education Amendments, were also discussed as possible resources. Finally, it was noted that proposals written as part of the RFP (Request for Proposal) process can be used to identify innovative approaches to addressing the elimination of sex stereotyping.

4. Academic Credit Seminars

Educators and employment/training personnel meeting in Boston were of one mind on the overriding prerequisite for successfully realizing YEDPA's academic credit mandate: the key to resolving issues of credit for work experiences, they agreed, is the prior relationships established between prime sponsor and educational agencies. This premise seemed particularly cogent in light of the confusion arising in some seminars due to lack of information and differences in terminology.

Participants learned that problems existed because of their different orientation to issues related to academic credit award. For example, in the education sector, work experience is a general term used for students participating in work-education programs; the labor sector view is that work experience is that which occurs for out-of-school persons, while career experience is that which occurs for those still in-school. A similar difference exists with regard to work activity supervision. Generally, it was found, the education sector has great concern for close supervision in a work-education program, while labor does not. This difference portends problems in evaluating the award of academic credit.

The evolving concept of academic credit was endorsed by all participants as contributing significantly to the quality of programs for youth. Having agreed that credit has a primary impact on an individual's personal development, participants strongly urged the development of a process whereby the individual can accumulate or "bank" credits.

Open and continuing dialogue among those in the labor and education sectors involved in YEDPA was not understood only as a need at the local levels. Boston participants also identified the importance of a Federal-State partnership for relating quality education and training to CETA. In fact, participants concluded with one recommendation they felt would better define the new direction of joint efforts; they suggested that perhaps CETA could be changed to CETEA (Comprehensive Education, Training, and Employment Act).

D. Atlanta Workshop (January 16-17, 1978)

1. Implementing YEDPA Seminars

See composite report on Implementing YEDPA, beginning on page 41.

2. Work Experience Seminars

The Work Experience seminars held in Atlanta enabled LEAs and prime sponsors from Regions IV and VII to address their acknowledged need for more open communication. In addition to exchanging both ideas and concerns about their respective and mutual roles, participants shared their views on several aspects of implementing quality work experiences.

Several of the LEAs present expressed their specific concern over agreements with prime sponsors which are essentially nonfinancial. These LEAs made it clear that they wanted to participate in meeting YEDPA's goals beyond just providing the school-based counselors who refer participants to the prime sponsors.

Both prime sponsors and LEAs agreed, however, that they are prepared to provide the full complement of transitional services to work experience activities. They concurred that these services would probably be concentrated in the areas of remedial education, employability skills, and job survival skills. All participants expressed the need to assist community-based organizations in operating YCCIP and YETP programs.

Although a consensus existed among LEAs that they intended to provide GED and skill training for CBOs, there was likewise a consistent problem expressed in their awarding academic credit. LEAs explained that in many areas, State and local laws prohibit them from awarding credit unless they are the sponsoring agency. [In one case reported, YCCIP participants are allowed to test for up to six months of the LEA's regular two-year training program when the YCCIP activity is relevant to the training provided by the LEA.]

Images of what work experiences would "look" like were also shared. Most of those present felt that only through testing and individualization could work experiences or on-the-job training be meaningful; there was general agreement that school-based counselors should be used both to provide this testing and also to assist the student in developing a vocational profile or individual employability plan before using any services under the Act.

While some expressed their interest for work experience to be available on a rotation basis, other participants hoped to see a ladder concept used wherein a student explores all aspects of a job cluster, beginning at the bottom of the cluster, and building to the area designated by a combination of interest, testing, and counseling.

In a final topic undertaken by participants, concern was expressed at the failure of DOL/DHEW to earmark special funds for staff training. With both prime sponsors and LEAs viewing work experiences and on-the-job training activities as opportunities to expand their current cooperative and distributive education programs, as well as to try out new and innovative approaches, there was a mutual request made that allocations for staff training be considered in any future funding.

3. Career Development Seminars

Participants in the Career Development seminars covered a wide range of topics and applied a basic problem-solving approach to specific issues such as improving career guidance and counseling programs and implementing career development activities for 14- and 15-year-olds.

While stating that little career guidance is being done at the postsecondary level, participants agreed that ongoing programs in career exploration, career guidance, and other transitional services are in place in many school systems. Peer counseling and the Living Witness program were two approaches mentioned as examples of how career guidance can be provided to secondary students. In the latter approach, business and industrial leaders visit schools to discuss working world realities with students.

One problem that participants raised with regard to career guidance and counseling concerned the preparation and training of counselors themselves. Training, it was felt, should encourage and enable guidance counselors to spend more time with the noncollege-bound students than is evidenced now. Secondly, the question was raised whether typical counselors have adequate work backgrounds themselves which would qualify them to relate the real world of work to students. Such lack of experience may explain why some counselors don't feel comfortable in providing vocational counseling.

Participants also shared some ideas in use that can ease these concerns. For instance, in some school districts, youth tutor youth. Additionally, some States have established laws requiring the use of occupational

specialists. An occupational specialist is a person who specifically devotes his/her time to providing occupational information to students. It is not necessary for this person to hold a college degree; what is important is that he or she has adequate work experience and can relate to students effectively.

Another issue discussed which raised several common problems within the group concerned the relationships of career development and work experience. Although agreeing that on-the-job training both complements and enhances career development for youth, participants mentioned local legal restrictions, limited job possibilities, and the difficulty in finding public work experience programs that correspond to vocational education activities as major barriers to maximum coordination of these two YEDPA thrusts.

Participants highlighted the following advantages offered students by on-the-job experiences, many of which they felt would act to instill in youth a more positive attitude and long-term view of their personal career decisions:

- the employer acts as the training station
- they offer an ideal situation for learning work habits (e.g., punctuality) and developing interpersonal skills so essential to job success
- they provide the opportunity for exploring a career
- they are real situations, not classroom simulations
- students are more motivated and feel productive when they can earn a wage.

The groups felt that low priority would probably be given to activities for 14- and 15-year-olds by virtue of YEDPA's mandate to employ those in the 16- to 21-year-old bracket. Many participants pointed out, however, that schools can still initiate any number of ways to serve the younger group, including extended day activities and training that provides employability skills by including 14- and 15-year-olds in career exploratory programs and even setting up business/industrial visitations for them. Participants agreed that 14- and 15-year-olds should receive basic skills and in-school vocational training.

In some cases, 14- and 15-year-olds can be employed in certain occupations and for a limited number of hours a day. Participants suggested, however, that Federal regulations limiting those hours should be changed to accommodate any State law (e.g., Florida) which allows 14- and 15-year-olds to work at least four hours per day.

Participants expressed common frustrations in realizing the potential of private sector involvement in YEDPA. Contributing to this problem, they felt, are the regulations which seem to discourage any significant cooperation with the private sector. One of the key mechanisms identified for developing private sector involvement was the use of advisory committees.

Similar to the ways in which advisory committees can increase and improve relationships with private business, advisory committees were identified as keys to gaining increased local support in combatting sex stereotyping and strengthening job placement efforts. Although, in the case of efforts to reduce sex stereotyping, films, slides, and brochures can be helpful, advisory councils offer a direct link to efforts being made in the work world (e.g., by unions, joint apprenticeship committees, etc.). It was further suggested that sex stereotyping could be effectively combatted through the use of resources from local women's groups and the development of good teacher in-service training on this issue.

In addition to advisory committees, it was suggested that job placement efforts could benefit by establishing job bank procedures and, in larger school districts, by hiring job developers. It seemed that currently prime sponsors are doing most job placement tasks but that there is a need to explore the assistance of others.

A final issue addressed by the Career Development participants focused on the usefulness of State labor market information to be collected under the Governor's Youth Program. Participants indicated that although State employment services and some prime sponsors can be helpful in providing that information on employment opportunities, every effort should be made to develop reliable and comprehensive information sources to project employment opportunities and provide specific information for job requirements.

4. Academic Credit Seminars

One of several overall recommendations resulting from this workshop was a strong suggestion that (especially with regard to academic credit) YEDPA should aim to supplement existing instructional programs rather than supplant or

duplicate them. While discussions led to consensus on similar resolutions and on areas requiring joint decision-making, participants seemed to have concentrated their attention most on delineating the separate roles of CETAs and LEAs in awarding academic credit.

In defining the responsibilities of prime sponsors, participants saw a specific role of theirs to be coordinating youth employment efforts with local labor unions. Otherwise the suggestions made applied more to prime sponsors' responsibilities in involving LEAs. For example:

- involve local and State education agencies in the plans relative to academic credit
- invest in LEAs the responsibility for verifying competencies and supervising work experiences
- charge LEAs to determine a method for certifying competencies for credit
- allow LEAs to carry on training efforts even if their "hands are tied" by statutory requirements in awarding academic credit.

The suggestions for the LEAs' role further amplified their responsibilities concerning academic credit award. Participants identified LEAs' responsibilities as ranging from matters of student eligibility to identifying and certifying competencies deserving of credit, and assuring that award of academic credit can be linked to existing courses. Furthermore, LEAs were thought to hold responsibility for (1) providing an avenue for academic credit award for in-school transition services and (2) assuring that CETA enrollees can be awarded the same amount of credit as is awarded other students.

As a result of clarifying these agencies' separate roles, participants were in a better position to delineate the areas of joint decision-making essential to YEDPA's success. These included the need to agree to a system for awarding credit that correlates with job-related instruction; to establish links with community-based organizations for awarding credit to applicable out-of-school youth; to identify subcontractors collectively; to decide upon a maximum time limit for academic credit award; and, finally, to maintain suitable agreements for work experience that specify the responsibilities of students, parents, employers, and schools.

While addressing many important aspects of academic credit, participants completed their discussions with several questions still unanswered. Many acknowledged that they were unclear on the precise definition of academic credit and that further definition and guidance for its interpretation was necessary. In addition, participants felt the need for further understanding on issues involved in the following questions:

- What is the role or degree of involvement of business/industry and union groups in the awarding of academic credit?
- In what ways can State education accreditation requirements be modified to make it permissible to grant credit for work experience (where applicable)?
- Should academic credit be awarded for work experience that has no significance in attaining skills necessary to adequately maintain on-the-job progress?

E. Cincinnati Workshop (January 19-20, 1978)

1. Implementing YEDPA Seminars

See the composite report on Implementing YEDPA, beginning on page 41.

2. Work Experience Seminars

In their discussions on work experience, Cincinnati participants focused primarily on the contributions made by community-based organizations (CBOs) and the private sector.

It was apparent that the degree of cooperation between LEAs and CBOs varies considerably. In some cases, it was reported, CBOs conduct only the out-of-school programs while LEAs conduct only the in-school programs; in some areas, CBOs are also involved in providing some transitional services. It was generally agreed, however, that CBOs may have better contacts with specific community groups which need to be served and can also act as youth advocates for in-school students.

Although participants concurred that Youth Councils, when properly utilized, should offer considerable assistance in fostering interagency linkages, few participants could report examples of this having yet occurred in their areas. Participants could report, however, that a variety of community agencies have been helpful to YETP youth in providing information on and finding them employment; in addition to CBOs, employment services agencies, mental health agencies, and children's services agencies were named.

There was a general feeling that YCCIP participants will be more productive for employers even though YETP seems to offer more work experience opportunities. One reason given for this feeling was that employers are inclined to view YETP participants as part-time help and so only expect limited productivity.

In communities where LEAs are already making wide use of both public and private employers to provide occupational training and work experiences for youth, participants urged both YETP and YCCIP directors to work closely with LEAs in expanding services. While participants did not feel that YCCIP was yet influencing changes in LEAs' vocational education programs, they agreed that this was certainly a goal to pursue.

When participants discussed the rotation method for providing work experience opportunities, some mixed feelings were expressed. Although some felt it was an effective method, others felt it posed formidable problems. In addition to the creation of immense clerical problems and prohibitive transportation demands, it was pointed out that employers and other employees find the constant movement of students into and out of jobs a nuisance.

3. Career Development Seminars

The major concerns raised in the Career Development seminars in Cincinnati related to the transitional services and other in-school employment activities of YETP. The key to a successful program was identified as making the match between these activities, the needs of the students, and the employment demands of the community.

Participants discussed their ideas on providing the necessary career information and nurturing positive work attitudes. They agreed that these goals depended on achieving a balance in identifying good resources and finding work sites for the youth.

Depending on their design and sophistication, career information systems can be put to use in a variety of ways. Job-related career information, participants noted, could include information on different careers, their education and/or training requirements, and opportunities for job entry. It was pointed out that, in addition, data on local, State, and national needs; supply; and demand were available from larger information networks. Where this information is not yet developed or synthesized, participants expected that the councils set up under YEDPA and the Vocational Education Amendments would prove to be extremely helpful.

Career information can be obtained directly as well. Participants listed career resource centers, youth councils, and representatives from business and industry as sources that should be explored. They also agreed that work simulation and field trips were excellent sources of direct exposure to careers, particularly for 14- and 15-year olds.

Participants agreed that counseling and guidance had to be emphasized in all programs.

Finally, an overall concern was expressed among participants about the limitations that exist for using the private sector in developing work sites; the major question related to the difficulty posed by the Federal rules and

regulations. After much discussion, participants agreed that careful planning and close supervision should make private sector involvement possible. They also felt that prime sponsors can be very helpful to LEAs by suggesting activities in and approaches to the private sector which comply with the legislation.

4. Academic Credit Seminars

The Academic Credit seminars discussed the "how" and "why" of academic credit. The answers to these questions reflected a majority opinion, if not the unanimous opinion of all 200 Cincinnati participants.

The consensus was that academic credit was very important to the success of students and the YETP program. It was also agreed that the process for establishing credit needed the complete cooperation of individuals and agencies involved.

The rationale developed for the importance of academic credit could be characterized by three words: motivation, credibility, and opportunity. Both prime sponsors and educators believed academic credit for work experience and related programs was important to students, especially those who were experiencing difficulty in earning enough credits to graduate from high school. Participants also pointed out the fact that many jobs require a high school diploma rather than a GED certificate.

In addition to being a motivating factor, academic credit was seen as an important source of credibility--- promoting the program's acceptance by the community, the school, students, and employers. Participants agreed that gaining approval for academic credit would represent proof that the students in the program had truly worked and learned. However, they strongly advised that YEDPA should not create an alternative educational system, but rather an alternative within the educational system.

Thirdly, academic credit toward the high school diploma was acknowledged as crucial to future opportunities. While admitting that a diploma does not assure employment, participants noted that it is often used as a major criteria in sorting out potential employees when there are more applicants than available jobs.

In discussing "how" credit is granted, participants found that decisions varied but could reside with either State or local education agencies. Usually, credit toward graduation depends on three requirements: (1) schools must approve and sometimes operate the for-credit programs; (2) the program must consist of a specific number of "clock hours" of instruction; and (3) the instruction must be certified by the appropriate agency. Participants recommended, however, that SEAs and LEAs must be flexible in establishing credit requirements to assure maximum support for participating YETP students.

Two final recommendations were also made. These further reflected participants' opinion on how credit should be granted:

- Schools must be involved in the planning and development of programs for which credit will be granted toward graduation. This request for credit must be made prior to the initiation of program activities.

- Credit should not be restricted to work experience programs, but should include the basic skills, career guidance and exploration, job skill training, and other components of a comprehensive youth training program.

IV. LIST OF FACILITATORS AND PRESENTERS

List of Facilitators and Presenters

The following list identifies the facilitators and presenters who led seminars at each of the five conferences. Further information on each individual (address and phone number) will be found in the enclosed lists.

Dallas

Implementing YEDPA	-	Genevieve Brembry William Crawford Joseph A. Hines
Work Experience	-	Patricia Keane Walter Rambo
Career Development	-	E. Neil Carey Diane Edwards
Academic Credit	-	Don Ciavacci Edward Coleman Ann Steigler

San Diego

Implementing YEDPA	-	William Crawford Esther Friedman Robert Ivry
Work Experience	-	Chris Chudd Jack P. Sappington
Career Development	-	Arvin C. Blome Diane Edwards
Academic Credit	-	Vincent D. Barry Gerri Fiola

Boston

Implementing YEDPA	-	Joseph A. Hines Robert Ivry Alan Weisberg
Work Experience	-	Donald E. Beineman Chris Chudd
Career Development	-	Diane Edwards John E. Radvany
Academic Credit	-	Cathy Day Al McKinnon

Atlanta

Implementing YEDPA	-	Joseph A. Hines Alan Weisberg Carl Wheeler
Work Experience	-	Don Eisinger Mary Silva
Career Development	-	Edward Coleman John F. Standridge
Academic Credit	-	Richard Campbell Jim McConnell

Cincinnati

Implementing YEDPA	-	Joseph A. Hines Carl Wheeler
Work Experience	-	Jack Rapport Jim Smith
Career Development	-	Diane Edwards Richard Jackson
Academic Credit	-	Edwin E. Cain Evelyn Ganzglass

V. COMPOSITE SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION FORMS, ALL FIVE CONFERENCES

A total of 1,089 people registered for the five YEDPA conferences held by DOL/DHEW from December 12, 1977 - January 20, 1978. Of this total, 409 (38 percent) were CETA prime sponsors; 483 (44 percent) were LEAs; and 197 (18 percent) represented national/regional DOL/DHEW offices, training and technical assistance contractors, education association representatives, and others.

A total of 449 participants (41.2 percent) completed evaluation forms. These represented 192 CETAs, 211 LEAs, and 46 others who returned evaluation forms.

Subsection A of this section will summarize statistical data compiled from evaluation forms, while the second subsection will include a summary of narrative comments made.

A. Statistical Summary

In response to the first three questions on the evaluation form, the following results were obtained. (It should be noted that not all respondents answered each question, so totals will occasionally differ.)

1. "Overall" Workshop Rating

Participants rated the "overall" workshop as follows:

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
LEAs	13	93	72	27	1
CETAs	7	48	81	42	9
Others	2	24	10	5	1
Total:	22	165	163	74	11

By weighting the responses to this question on a scale of 1-5 (Poor-Excellent) and dividing the total rating by number of respondents, the following aggregate ratings can be obtained:

LEAs	3.436
CETAs	2.903
Others	3.500

The total aggregate rating to this question for all participants would be 3.259, or slightly above the "good" rating.

2. Workshop Goal Achievement

a. In terms of effectiveness of the workshop in encouraging prime sponsors, LEAs, and other community agencies to collaborate in helping young people, the following responses were received:

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
LEAs	27	95	58	28	2
CETAs	15	64	68	36	8
Others	5	20	14	4	1
Total:	47	179	140	68	11

When these responses are weighted on a scale of 1-5 (Poor-Excellent) and the total rating is divided by the number of respondents, the following aggregate ratings can be obtained:

LEAs	3.495
CETAs	3.219
Others	3.545

The total aggregate rating for this question for all respondents is a 3.411, almost midway between "good" and "very good."

b. Regarding effectiveness of the workshop in stimulating the development, adaptation, and spread of better quality career employment experiences for young people, the following responses were given:

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
LEAs	13	68	83	36	5
CETAs	6	50	63	56	14
Others	3	15	13	11	-
Total:	22	133	159	103	19

For this question, the aggregate ratings, based on a scale of 1-5 (Poor-Excellent), are as follows:

LEAs	3.234
CETAs	2.883
Others	3.238

The total aggregate rating for this question for all respondents is 3.082, or almost exactly a "good" rating.

3. Usefulness of Each Seminar

Participants ranked each of the four seminars (Implementing YEDPA, Academic Credit, Work Experience, and Career Development) on a different basis (of Not Useful - Very Useful). Evaluation forms included the following responses:

a. Implementing YEDPA

	Very Useful	Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful
LEAs	60	82	52	13
CETAs	44	65	59	22
Others	15	19	6	2
Total:	119	166	117	37

b. Academic Credit

	Very Useful	Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful
LEAs	20	88	84	19
CETAs	29	55	73	21
Others	4	16	17	2
Total:	53	159	174	42

c. Work Experience

	Very Useful	Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful
LEAs	23	106	63	11
CETAs	20	62	77	27
Others	3	23	14	1
Total:	46	191	154	39

d. Career Development

	Very Useful	Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful
LEAs	18	94	77	15
CETAs	22	61	77	26
Others	7	22	11	2
Total:	47	177	165	43

e. Aggregate Ratings for Four Workshops

To obtain aggregate ratings for the four workshops, a slightly different scale was applied. "Not useful" was assigned a 0 rating; "somewhat useful" became 1; "useful" was assigned a 2; and "very useful" became a 3. Based on this scale, the four seminars received the following aggregate ratings:

	Implementing YEDPA	Academic Credit	Work Experience	Career Development
LEAs	1.744	1.511	1.694	1.563
CETAs	1.689	1.516	1.403	1.419
Others	2.119	1.564	1.568	1.809

Thus, in rank order LEAs found the Implementing YEDPA seminar most useful, followed by Work Experience, Career Development, and Academic Credit. In rank order, CETAs also found the Implementing YEDPA seminar most useful, followed by Academic Credit, Career Development, and Work Experience. The "others" also rated Implementing YEDPA as first, followed by Career Development, Work Experience, and Academic Credit.

4. Portions of the Workshop of Greatest and Least Benefit

Regarding the next question ("Which portion of the workshop was of greatest benefit to you?"), the responses followed a fairly consistent pattern. In the interest of simplification, we have generalized all miscellaneous comments (appearing a total of five or fewer times on evaluation forms) into a category entitled "miscellaneous." The major categories were as follows, listed in rank order of total number of responses (except for the "miscellaneous" category):

	LEAs	CETAs	Others	Total
1. LEA/CETA interaction/ sharing	55	47	9	111
2. Implementing YEDPA seminar	42	55	13	110
3. Academic Credit seminar	27	36	2	65
4. Luncheon speaker	22	15	2	39
5. Work Experience seminar	14	17	3	34
6. All four seminars	20	9	3	32
7. Career Development seminar	12	15	3	30

		LEAs	CETAs	Others	Total
8.	General session (1st day)	12	9	2	23
9.	General session (2nd day)	15	7	1	23
10.	Use of Phillips 66 technique	6	5	1	12
11.	Harbor City Project	1	7	-	8
12.	Miscellaneous	11	7	3	21

The next question ("Which portion of the workshop was of least benefit to you?") also elicited a fairly consistent pattern of responses. As above, comments appearing five or fewer times on evaluation forms have been grouped under "miscellaneous," and major categories (listed in rank order, except for "miscellaneous") were as follows:

		LEAs	CETAs	Others	Total
1.	Implementing YEDPA seminar	29	38	2	69
2.	Academic Credit seminar	25	29	6	60
3.	Career Development seminar	21	20	3	44
4.	Work Experience seminar	16	24	4	44
5.	Use of Phillips 66 technique	14	18	-	32
6.	General session (2nd day)	14	9	2	25
7.	Luncheon speaker	11	4	2	17
8.	General session (1st day)	8	6	1	15
9.	Lack of answers/ interpretation of regulations	8	5	1	14
10.	All four seminars	9	2	1	12
11.	Miscellaneous	11	16	3	30

It is interesting to note that although some categories were rated both as "of least benefit" and "of greatest benefit," no one expressed a negative reaction about the top-ranked "of greatest benefit" category---LEA/CETA interaction/sharing. It is also of note that Implementing YEDPA was at the top of both lists; it was seen as being "of greatest benefit" to 110 people and "of least benefit" to 69. Likewise, Academic Credit was high on both lists; it was rated as "of greatest benefit" to 65 people and "of least benefit" to 60. Also interesting is that although Work Experience and Career Development received a number of positive ratings (34 and 30, respectively), more participants felt that these sessions were "of least benefit" (each session received 44 responses in this category).

Opinions were also divided on other categories; while the luncheon speaker received 39 "of greatest benefit" ratings, he also received 17 "of least benefit." Although each general session was rated as "of greatest benefit" by 23 people, 25 others rated the second day's general session and 15 rated the first day's general session as "of least benefit."

The single areas of greatest disagreement, however, seems to revolve around use of the Phillips 66 technique. Not only did 32 people rank it "of least benefit" as opposed to 12 who ranked it "of greatest benefit," but this area also drew considerable narrative reaction, as will be shown in the next section.

B. Summary of Narrative Comments

The final question on the evaluation form ("How would you change the workshop to improve its effectiveness?") elicited a number of comments, many of which are too lengthy to quote in their entirety. Thus, we have taken the liberty of grouping these comments according to the general thrust of the subject matter. (Direct quotes were provided in the individual summary evaluation of each specific conference.)

1. Use of the Phillips 66 Technique

Comments on the use of the Phillips 66 technique centered around (1) the format itself and (2) the questions used.

Although six comments (made by four LEAs and two CETAs) indicated that Phillips 66 was a good format, the following appeared to be more representative of group reactions:

	LEAs	CETAs	Others	Total
Prefer lectures and/or unstructured discussions	5	9	-	14
Need pre-conference information on Phillips 66/copies of questions	10	2	-	12
Need more information/ explanation on Phillips 66	5	4	2	11
Phillips 66 inappropriate for this stage	3	3	3	9
Need more time for discussion	3	2	-	5
Want instruction, not discussion	3	1	-	4
Miscellaneous suggestions re format	2	1	-	3
Prefer case-study approach	-	2	-	2

Reactions to the questions themselves were somewhat mixed. No specific positive comments about the questions were made. A total of 19 respondents said that better questions were needed; 8 people indicated the desire for LEAs/CETAs to generate the questions; 6 suggested that fewer questions be used, while 2 recommended that the questions be enlarged. Ten other miscellaneous comments related to lack of relevance of questions to all geographic areas, omission of references to regulations, lack of answers by workshop leaders to questions, etc.

2. Workshop Timing

A total of 24 people (8 LEAs, 15 CETAs, and 1 other) commented that the workshops came too late in relation to the stage of development of LEA/CETA agreements. Two people (one CETA and one LEA) said that notice for the workshops was too short. Ten participants (eight LEAs and two CETAs) requested that additional State, local, or some other type of workshops be held as follow-up to this set of workshops.

3. Workshop Structure/Content

A variety of comments were made regarding the content, structure, and length of the workshop. The single most prevalent suggestion (made by 9 LEAs, 20 CETAs, and 2 others) was that the workshop should have been longer, to allow more time for small-group discussions. (Only two LEAs and two CETAs suggested that it should have been shorter.)

Participants' recommendations included that:

a. Additional time be allotted for:

(1) General sessions (2 LEAs)
(2) Small-group sessions (1 LEA, 4 CETAs)
(3) Sessions for separate geographic areas (3 LEAs, 2 CETAs)
(4) Technical assistance (1 CETA)
(5) Additional workshop offerings (1 CETA)
(6) Buzz sessions with DOL/DHEW representatives (4 LEAs, 1 CETA)
(7) A meeting of LEAs and their corresponding prime sponsors (3 LEAs, 1 CETA)
(8) A meeting for all BOS prime sponsors (1 CETA)

b. An orientation session be held to discuss/provide an overview of the legislation, prior to the opening general session of the workshop (1 LEA, 2 CETAs, 2 others)

c. The second general session (summary) be shorter (2 LEAs, 1 CETA) or be replaced with written summaries of small-group discussions (1 LEA, 2 CETAs)

Other miscellaneous suggestions included that: the second day begin with a general session (1 LEA); presentations be made by LEAs and CETA prime sponsor representatives themselves (1 CETA); fewer subjects be discussed (1 LEA); and an optional seminar be held for people who had already begun implementing the legislation (1 LEA).

4. Information Needs

Numerous needs for information were cited by participants on evaluation forms. In addition to the rather nonspecific "need for more answers from resource people/Federal representatives" (mentioned by 7 LEAs and 3 CETAs) and the "need for more answers from workshop leaders regarding interpretation/implementation of the legislation" (mentioned by 16 LEAs and 14 CETAs), the following information needs were stated:

	LEA	CETA	Other	Total
a. Need pre-conference information	12	13	1	26
b. Need more information on:				
---model program development	4	5	-	9
---"how-to's"	4	2	-	6
---CETA/LEA agreements	1	3	-	4
---DOL youth programs	2	1	-	3
---academic credit	2	-	-	2
---the future	-	1	1	2
---career development	1	-	-	1
---resources/technical assistance	-	1	-	1
---rural public schools	-	1	-	1
---evaluation	-	1	-	1
---audio-visual aids	-	1	-	1

Suggestions were also made that sample agreements be provided to participants (5 LEAs, 7 CETAs) and that a

lexicon of definitions/acronyms be made available (5 LEAs, 1 CETA) to assist participants unfamiliar with DOL/DHEW jargon.

5. Participant Grouping Procedures

A variety of recommendations were made regarding the assignment of participants to small-group sessions, a summary of which follows:

	LEA	CETA	Other	Total
Change groupings so that the same participants are not together the entire time	6	2	1	9
Group participants by State	2	1	1	4
Group participants according to LEAs/CETAs of similar size	-	1	-	1
First, separate CETAs and LEAs; then mix	-	1	-	1

6. Invitation Process

Numerous suggestions were made regarding the types of people from various professions who "should have been invited" to attend the conference. In summary, participants said that the group should have included:

	LEA	CETA	Other	Total
Labor union representatives	4	-	1	5
Major CBOs	2	-	1	3
More LEAs	1	2	-	3
State Education Agency representatives	2	-	-	2
School administrators	2	-	-	2
Academic educators, guidance counselors, and youth	1	1	-	2

	LEA	CETA	Other	Total
Representatives of teacher organizations	1	-	-	1
Vocational education coordinators	-	1	-	1
More LEAs in the lead role	1	-	-	1
More CETAs in the lead role	-	-	1	1
SES representatives	-	-	1	1
Fewer States at each conference	1	-	-	1
Only LEAs and prime sponsors directly involved with YE PA	-	1	-	1

7. Other Comments

Only a handful of miscellaneous comments were made. Ten people (4 LEAs, 4 CETAs, and 2 others) expressed the desire that "more qualified" trainers/facilitators be available, particularly to moderate the groups and serve as resource people. The need for more technical comments and interpretation of the legislation by DOL was expressed by 1 LEA and 1 CETA. A total of 23 suggestions/criticisms/general comments represented the remainder of the statements made on evaluation forms.

82 U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1978 O-720-343/9106